

SELECTED MAJOR SPEECHES AND EXCERPTS

from

NASPA's 55th ANNUAL CONFERENCE

April 1973

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

NASPA

National

Association

of

Student

Personnel

Administrators

MONOGRAPH NO. 4, OCTOBER 1973

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

(THE ASSOCIATION OF DEANS AND ADMINISTRATORS OF STUDENT AFFAIRS FOUNDED IN 1919)

Executive Committee (1972-73)

President
Thomas B. Dutton
Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs
University of California, Davis
Davis, California 95616

Davis, Carreller President-Elect John L. Blackburn Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs University of Denver Denver, Colorado 80210

Immediate Past-President
Chester E. Peters
Vice-President, Student Affairs
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

Conference Chairperson
James R. Appleton
Vice-President, Student Affairs
University of Southern California
Lös Angeles, California 90007

Conference Chairperson-Elect Thomas C. Schreck Dean of Students Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana 47401

JOURNAL Editor
Martin J. Meade
Deal of Students
Ottawa University
Ottawa, Kansas 66067

Placement Officer
Richard E. Hulet
Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs
State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Controller

Channing M. Briggs
Dean, Admissions and Records
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207

Regional Vice-Presidents
1 Richard F. Stevens
Vice-Provost, Student Affairs
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

Durnam, New Hampshire 038
II Richard A. Siggelkow
Vice-President, Student Affairs
SUNY-Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14214

Buffalo, New York 14214

III John D. Jones
Vice-President, Student Affairs
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee 38111

IV William R. Nester
East Vice-Provost, Student Affairs
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

West Dean of Students
Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, Kansas 67601

Hays, Kansas 6/601

V Kent T. Hawley
Dean of Students
Lewis and Clark College
Portland, Oregon 97219

VI George B. Hibbard
Dean of Students
California State College, Bakersfield
Bakersfield, California 93309

Division Directors
Association Personnel and Services
Lenora Cole
Assistant to Vice-President
for Student Affairs
SUNY-Buffalo
Buffalo, New York 14214
Professional Development and Standards
Kenneth R. Venderbush
Vice-President, Student Affairs
Grand Valley State College
Allendale, Michigan 49401
Professional Relations and Levislation

Professional Relations and Legislation Stronal Relations and Legislat Edward H. Hammond Office of Vice President, Student Affairs Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Research and Program Development C. Arthur Sandeen Dean of Students Iowa State University Ames, Iowa 50010

Ames, 10wa 30010

Members-At-Large
Donald V. Adams
Vice President, Student Life
Drake University
Des Moines, Iowa 50311 C. W. Grant Dean for Student Affairs Albany State College Albany, Georgia 31705 Karen T. Rigg Assistant Dean, Student Affairs Boston University Boston, Massachusetts 02215 Leon Robinson
Dean of Student Services
Miami-Dade Junior College
(Downtown Campus)
Miami, Florida 33132

Executive Committee (1973-74)

President

John L. Blackburn Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs University of Denver Denver, Colorado 80210

President-Elect

Vice-President, Student Affairs
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

Immediate Past-President
Thomas B. Dutton
Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs
University of California, Davis
Davis, California 95616

Conference Chairperson
Thomas C. Schreck
Dean of Students
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Conference Chairperson-Elect Alice R. Manicur Vice-President, Student Affairs & DOS Frostburg State College Frostburg, Maryland 21533

JOURNAL Editor
Martin J. Meade
Dean of Students
Ottawa University
Ottawa, Kansas 66067

Placement Officer
Richard E. Hulet
Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs
State University System of Florida
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Controller

Channing M. Briggs
Dean, Admissions and Records
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207

Regional Vice-Presidents I Donald P. Hardy Vice-President, Student Affairs Rhode Island College Providence, Rhode Island 02908

II Frank B. Williams Dean of Students Gettysburg College Gettysburg, Pennsylvania 17325

III O. Suthern Sims Vice-President, Student Affairs Furman University Greenville, South Carolina 29613

IV William R. Nester East Vice-Provost, Student Affairs University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio 45221

US Bill D. Jellison
West Dean of Students
Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, Kansas 67601
V Kent T. Hawley
Dean of Students
Lewis and Clark College
Portland, Oregon 97219

VI T. Roger Nudd Dean of Student Services California State University Fullerton, California 92634

Division Directors
Association Personnel and Services
Lenora Cole
Vice-President for Student Life The American University Washington, D.C. 20016

Professional Development and Standards
George W. Young
Vice-President, Student Development
Broward Community College
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

Professional Relations and Legislation
Edward H. Hammond
Vice-President, Student Affairs
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey 07079

Research and Program Development
Edward E. Birch
Vice-President, Student Affairs
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio 43015

Members-At-Large
Alice F. Emerson
Dean of Students
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104 Ernestine Holloway Dean of Students
Tougaloo College
Tougaloo, Mississippi 39174

Alfred L. Moye Vice-Chancellor, Student Affairs University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260 Marie R. Prahl Dean, Student Personnel Services
Charles Stewart Mott
Community College
Flint, Michigan 48503

SELECTED MAJOR SPEECHES AND EXCERPTS

from

NASPA's 55th ANNUAL CONFERENCE

April 1973

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Compiled by

JAMES R. APPLETON 1973 CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN, NASPA

Vice President, Student Affairs University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007

INDEX

Page
Critical Functions and Behaviors of the Student Affairs Administrator —
Thomas B. Dutton
Tomorrow's Students, Tomorrow's Colleges — Who Plans? —
Joseph Cosand
Futuristic Modes and Models In Human Relations —
Jeanne Noble
Organizational Change Processes: A Political Systems Approach —
J. Victor Baldridge 30
Charge to Student Affairs Officers: Bring human development into focus in our universities and colleges, think in systemic terms —
Warren Bennis
Trying To Be Real, But Compared To What?—
Benjamin F. Payton 40
Educational Capitalism, Educational Welfarism, and the Counseling Syndrome —
John L. Blackburn

Preface

Dr. Dutton, retiring president of NASPA, provides an important statement regarding the critical functions and behaviors of student affairs administrators. He calls for such administrators to articulate the learning requirements of students and to press for necessary change.

Dr. Cosand challenges the student personnel administrator to exercise educational leadership by understanding and thereby affecting the educational planning processes and curriculum development. He argues that our role and function should give us a perspective about students, their needs and potential which is required for this task. It is essential that a closer working relationship be established by the student personnel administrator with the instructional staff and other top administrative officers to demonstrate very specific ways major contributions of student personnel administrators can link to the overall goals, objectives and plans of the institution. This participation may well require the development of new skills and expertise but the basic knowledge upon which to build is intact.

Dr. Noble deals with the problem of power and powerlessness in institutions and their place in any future restructuring of human relations. She advocates a dedication on our part to a realignment of power in our institutions. She wants us with caution and indignation to "...love powerfully."

Dr. Baldridge presents a point of view regarding how institutions change. Change potential may be increased by viewing the institution as a miniature political system with fluid participation that is run by professionals, that has unclear goals, wth unclear technology, diffuse goal-making systems and fluid kinds of decision-making structures. He presents a strategy for effecting change — for the young aspiring Machiavellian.

Dr. Bennis presents a charge to student affairs officers — to bring human development into focus at our universities and colleges, to think in systemic terms, to develop social indicators of what a learning community is, and to develop a power position from which such insights may be communicated.

Dr. Payton calls for a re-evaluation of our relations with students. The day of merely emoting with students and being sympathetic must be over. There is a discipline involved in the university. If we are going to help students we must expose them to the greater degree of seriousness of purpose which is required.

Dr. Blackburn argues that student personnel work, like the rest of higher education, has an obsession with the individual and personal development thereby forgetting the importance of a healthy community. Further, educators too frequently have been responders rather than change agents. Student development, good mental health, and individual personal development might be viewed as by-products of healthy campus communities. If we have healthy, vibrant, intellectual communities, students will learn, will develop, and will hopefully carry community-developed skills into the larger society.

James R. Appleton Conference Chairman 1973 Vice President, Student Affairs University of Southern California

Critical Functions and Behaviors of the Student Affairs Administrator

Thomas B. Dutton

I. INTRODUCTION

Today marks the end of my year as President of NASPA. I question the sanity and intelligence of anyone who would take this job; it requires a creative blend of masochism and compulsiveness. Thank goodness the Lord giveth and taketh away! Seriously, it has been a rewarding year, and I feel honored to have been selected to serve NASPA as President.

After long reflection over what I might say in this address, I concluded that I could only talk with authority about what I have experienced as a practitioner who has survived 17 years in four different institutions. Basically, I will comment on the insights I have gained into the needs, requirements, and demands of the job of the student affairs administrator. The focus of my remarks will be on the critical or essential functions and behaviors that are related to success in our field.

This then will be a personal account which will be perfectly objective, rational and free of biases. I will make some bold assertions that I really cannot support with data, but since I am about to leave office, I will take the liberty. Bold assertions, however, can lead to trouble. One of Steinbeck's favorite stories will illustrate my point. In a moment of clear insight, one man at a bar shouted, "Only prostitutes and the Green Bay Packers could live in Wisconsin." To this the biggest man in the bar replied: "Sir, my mother lives in Wisconsin," to which the first man replied: "How long has she been on the team?" I will try to be sufficiently vague so I too can cover my misjudgments with clear insight after the fact.

My experiences have been rewarding but there have been moments of challenge when I felt like the administrator who died and went to hell. He was in Hades four days before he realized it. The surroundings were all too familiar to him.

At times I have considered giving it all up and trying something else. But the hardest job in the world is finding an easier one. Yet, there have been the many rewarding moments when I have seen growth in students and staff and when I have been helped by students and colleagues in my own development. These moments have made it all worthwhile.

II. TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The job of the student affairs administrator has never been easy and the future does not look any less demanding. Significant changes are underway in higher education that have implications for student affairs work. Let me briefly summarize some of these changes.

Thomas B. Dutton is Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs University of California, Davis He served as NASPA President, 1972-73 A. Present and future attendance patterns present a significant challenge. Many institutions are faced with enrollment problems, and little or no growth in the college-age population is expected over the next 20 years. Furthermore, many of these students are either "dropping out," seeking more relevant educational experiences, or attending vocational or proprietary schools.

At the same time there is a decline in the proportion of public funds allocated to higher education, and in view of inflation, a steady-state economy, and increased competition for funds, improvement of the financial picture cannot be expected in the near future. The situation is even more bleak when the federal government's commitment to higher education is taken into account. It is obvious that decisions in such areas as financial aid, graduate education, research and building construction indicate the lower priority of higher education in the administration's planning.

These trends mean even tighter budgets; more emphasis on efficient administration, management systems, and accountability; and greater central control. What does this suggest for the student affairs field? Student affairs administrators must be prepared to reexamine the values of various programs and services and to implement zero-base budgeting. If it were necessary to start over with reduced resources, what would be discarded? What would be retained? How would it be organized?

B. A second major trend in higher education is the growing conflict over educational mission. Some feel that institutions should accommodate a narrow range of students and academic interests and pursue truth and knowledge apart from society. Others feel that our institutions should be open to all, serve an increasingly diverse population, and be responsive to community needs and problems. The issue is: elitism versus egalitarianism.

There is also conflict over institutional response to constant change in our society. Institutions and their faculties tend to be conservative and slow to change. In fact, an essential function of a university or college is to deliberately and objectively analyze problems and to interpret the intellectual heritage. Yet in a rapidly changing society, institutions of higher learning are expected to be responsive to change and to facilitate it. And so there is conflict between continuity and change and between conservation of knowledge and discovery of new ideas. This has significance for student affairs administrators since they are caught in the same paradox. Do they maintain the status quo or facilitate change? How can they both maintain continuity and stimulate discovery of new ideas and approaches?

C. Another important educational trend is the increased emphasis on upgrading the quality of the learning process. New curricular patterns are emerging. There are attempts to permit completion of degrees in less time; to reduce restrictions and lock-step requirements; and to increase educational options; e.g., extended learning, inter-disciplinary and integrated studies, independent study, and work-learn. Occasionally these improvements have not always accomplished their intended purpose. For example, it was reported in connection with the Watergate trial that a student had been planted as a spy in the campaign headquarters of Senators McGovern and Muskie. He was paid \$3400 and received college credit. This is carrying work-learn and credit for experience a bit far!

Despite the emphasis on innovation, financial restrictions and faculty commitment to traditional modes of teaching make it difficult to achieve creative educational changes. Yet, one way or another the teaching-learning process will be revitalized and the student affairs administrator can play a vital role in this renewal.

D. There also is growing diversity among students. At one time, higher education was essentially a closed society consisting of more affluent, privileged students. During the past several years, however, colleges and universities have become much more accessible to a wider range of students. The "opening up" of higher education has brought to campuses the so-called "new students" from new social strata and circumstances — students who were previously excluded. These are the ethnic minorities, women students, older students, and part-time students. They represent a somewhat different set of needs that may come into conflict with traditional educational views, and their development demands new and creative responses.

In addition, the so-called "traditional students" are constantly changing. Obviously, students seem more serious and concerned about academic survival. They are spending more time in the library and striving for admission to graduate and professional schools and for good jobs. Although campuses are quiet, many students are still concerned about societal issues, such as the quality of the environment, community politics, and consumer problems.

Many students are placing sensory experience above conceptual knowledge and are de-emphasizing science and technology. Others are rejecting official authority and those who represent it and are trying to develop alternatives to established institutions.

But there are also students who are concerned about the quality of education and want to improve it by increasing educational options and creating more opportunity for selfdevelopment.

It is obvious, then, that there is great diversity within our student bodies. Students have varied needs and abilities, different views about educational purpose and priorities, and require diverse forms of education. This diversity must be recognized in the planning of the curriculum and the student affairs program.

E. Still another significant development in higher education is the expansion of employment opportunities for women and ethnic minorities. This development is long overdue and institutions must give more attention to the establishment and effective implementation of affirmative action programs.

To what extent are women and ethnic minorities represented on our staffs? A study that is now being completed by the NASPA Research Division indicates that there is still underrepresentation and the problem is particularly critical at higher administrative levels. For example, in 87% of the institutions reporting, the chief student affairs officer was a white male.

All of us can and must do more to achieve better representation of women and ethnic minorities on our staffs.

III. FACTORS RELATED TO EFFECTIVENESS IN STUDENT AFFAIRS WORK

How can the student affairs administrator function effectively and make a difference as institutions respond to these and other changes?

A. EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT

First, a greater effort must be made to place student affairs work in a broader educational context. Too often, emphasis has been placed on services, activities, counseling, or student development programs without giving sufficient thought to their interface with the larger

educational environment and whether they, in fact, further institutional goals. It is essential that the student affairs program reinforce the objectives, and philosophy of the total educational program.

B. PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY

To be effective, the student affairs administrator must also have a clear sense of his or her own educational philosophy. I will illustrate by describing a model for student development I am refining. This is just one point of view; obviously, there are many models that can work depending on individual perspective and institutional setting.

The model I have in mind is based on the assumption that the student is the primary educational unit—not the course or the curriculum—and that he should chart his own educational program in relation to an assessment of abilities, needs and interests. This assessment would be translated into a profile of both proficiencies and weaknesses that would guide the course of study. This seems to be the best way to actualize forces within the student that will permit him to function with independence and creativity and to develop his talents to the fullest.

Perception of the role of students in the educational process will dictate the type of learning environment that is developed. Are they seen as learner-apprentices, or as partners in the learning process? In my judgment, students should not only be actively involved in developing their own educational program but they should have a meaningful role in decision-making for the total community.

The model I am suggesting recognizes that students have both cognitive and non-cognitive needs. But, the non-cognitive area has been neglected; that is, feelings, emotions, and inter-personal relationships of students have not been considered important. In the non-cognitive area, institutions have failed to help students come to grips with such questions as, "What is life all about?" "What really matters?" "What should I stand for?" "Who am I?"

More experiences must be provided to help students integrate both the cognitive and the non-cognitive because the individual has a wide variety of developmental needs which develop in interaction with each other, not separately. To accomplish this, more effort must be made to develop inter-disciplinary studies, living-learning experiences, and work-and-field activities through which students can apply what they have learned in the classroom.

This model also recognizes that students bring to the campus diverse needs, abilities, learning styles and values; that their abilities and values are at varying levels of development; and that they respond to different types of educational stimuli. Some students are quite secure and open to change; others are frightened and insecure; some are threatened by new ideas and values; others lack impulse control. Some respond to complex concepts directly, but for others such concepts become clear only through such activities as work and field experiences. Many students want the traditional major; others want to explore a variety of fields in new ways. There must be provision for such diversity of need in the curriculum. In this way, institutions can more effectively help heterogenous student populations develop and grow into creative, self-learning individuals.

In my institution this model has been built into our new academic plan. The Davis administration has created a structure that facilitates integration of learning activity and focuses on the development of new approaches to the improvement of learning. An attempt

has been made to break down the separation between the academic and the non-academic, and to recognize that learning activities should be integrated and that this can be facilitated by shared responsibility between student affairs and academic affairs.

C. Administrative Theory and Behavior

I have suggested up to this point that the student affairs program must be related to the total curriculum and that student affairs administrators must clarify their own educational philosophy if they are to be effective. But, increasingly, administrative skill also is required by institutions of higher learning. A more scientific approach to student affairs work must be established. There certainly is an artistic dimension to student affairs administration; emotion, intuition, and subjective analysis are important in our work but they cannot be relied on solely. A scientific foundation must also be developed. To accomplish this, administrative behavior must be described; that is, a factual description of basic functions and duties must be completed. Once there is a sufficient factual base, more accurate predictions about consequences of behavior can be made, which is essential in sound decision-making.

Administration is the process through which institutions accomplish their objectives and the fundamental vehicle of administration is the decision-making process. The measure of the effectiveness of decision-making is the degree to which goals are achieved. The measure of the power of an individual in the organization is his or her ability to influence the decision-making process.

What does this mean for the student affairs field? The purpose of our institutions is teaching and learning. The administrative process is designed to accomplish this purpose. This process is critical because through it fundamental decisions are made regarding institutional direction, allocation of resources, program development, rights, freedoms, and so on. What weight do student affairs administrators have in this process? Do they count? Are they consulted? Whether they count and are consulted will depend on the quality of their input into the process; that is, the expertise and the knowledge they bring to decision-making.

Obviously, the quality of input will depend on the individual administrator—his or her talents and values, and the level of trust and respect he or she has developed in others. But how can involvement be enhanced or modified if necessary? In part, the answer lies in an understanding of the factors that tend to determine administrative behavior.

(1) Who we are and what we believe will be major determinants of our actions. More specifically, values, convictions, aspirations, and needs will influence administrative behavior. If values and convictions are understood, direction will be clearer and responses in different situations will be more effective.

Character also is important. The quality of courage, leadership ability, dedication, loyalty, sensitivity to the needs of others, and openness will make a great difference in the level of performance. Likewise, emotional toughness and the ability to function in the face of critical demands are very important.

- (2) Moreover, one's educational philosophy is critical in determining how the student affairs administrator will function in the educational environment. Each person needs to clarify his or her own educational philosophy and objectives.
- (3) The goals, objectives, philosophy, traditions, life style, and governance patterns of the institution will likewise have an impact on the behavior of the administrator. Obviously, he or she will function in an institutional context and cannot work in isolation

of this setting. Depending on personal values, convictions, and needs, some institutions are better for the individual than others. Some provide a more creative environment while others may be somewhat destructive. Institutional-personal fit is very important. If there is a bad fit there will be discontent and performance will suffer.

(4) Another factor that influences administrative behavior is the perception of others with regard to the responsibilities and effectiveness of the student affairs administrator. Misperceptions of values, convictions, and role obviously will have an impact on the quality of his or her work

There is evidence that student affairs administrators do not always accurately assess how they are perceived by others. In a 1970 NASPA study of the assumptions and beliefs of members of the academic community, it was found that there was significant disparity between how student affairs administrators saw themselves and how students viewed them. The administrators described themselves as warm, friendly people, committed to student welfare, but the students felt that the administrators were less concerned with student welfare and more control oriented.

Does this disparity in perceptions result from misperceptions of role by the student affairs administrator or from certain negative aspects of their work that blot or blur the more positive contributions?

(5) How the role of the student affairs administrator is defined within the institution is still another determinant of his or her actual behavior. For example, if the primary role is to protect campus morals by controlling deviate conduct then the administrator will behave one way. If the upholding of institutional values is a shared community responsibility, very different behavior will result. If the prescribed role is a manager of services, the student affairs administrator will perform as a manager. On the other hand, if the primary responsibility is to contribute to student development, the student affairs administrator will serve as a facilitator of learning.

In summary, then, better understanding of the many factors that determine behavior should better equip the student affairs administrator to make necessary role modifications.

IV. PRIMARY FUNCTIONS OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS ADMINISTRATOR

To move to a more viable job definition, consideration must also be given to what functions are actually performed. Through such an analysis it is possible to identify proper and improper use of time and make adjustments to function more effectively.

Obviously, people in student affairs work perform differentiated roles depending on the institutional setting and level and breadth of responsibility. As institutions have become more complex, varied roles have evolved. There are generalist roles, specialist roles, line jobs, and staff jobs. Persons in vice presidential jobs in large institutions have different responsibilities than those in smaller institutions. There is need for high-level educational planners as well as staff who work directly with students.

The challenge is to find the right level or role. Some, I suspect, can perform at any level or in any job but all cannot be vice presidents, deans of students or counselors—and all should not. Each person must understand what he or she is capable of doing and seek the appropriate role.

Student affairs work can be divided into three major areas: planning or critical decision-making functions, administrative functions, and direct educational functions.

The planning-decision-making functions include: setting goals and priorities, formulating policy, creating and assessing educational environments, allocating resources, and developing plans of action.

The administrative functions include: coordination, management, communication, consultation, leadership, facilitation, and process and program evaluation.

The direct educational functions are: teaching, counseling, program development, and services to students.

It would be interesting to know the value each of us attaches to these functions and also how much time is actually devoted to each type. I suspect that there would be significant debate over the importance of planning and administrative functions versus direct educational functions.

The higher the level of administrative responsibility the greater the emphasis on decision-making and administrative functions and the less opportunity for direct involvement in educational activities. This, of course, will vary with institutonal size and breadth of responsibility, but I have found that even student affairs administrators in smaller schools are being forced to give more time to decision-making and administrative functions because of reduction in resources and demand for fiscal accountability.

I would like to discuss the basic functions of planning, administrative, and education in greater detail primarily from the perspective of critical responsibilities of the chief student affairs officer.

A. Greater emphasis must be placed on the planning functions. This means that the student affairs administrator must be more actively involved in setting institutional goals, policies, and priorities; allocating resources; and developing educational environments. These are the functions that really count because through their exercise, educational purpose, structure, and program are determined. This is the level where educational philosophy can be applied, where student needs can be expressed, and where educational programs and services can be proposed. To be cut off from high-level planning decisions is to reduce the impact of the student affairs administrator on the teaching-learning process. With this emphasis I am not trying to downgrade the importance of contact with students; this contact is most important to maintain proper knowledge of student needs. But to be excluded from top-level decision-making reduces considerably the role the student affairs administrator can play in creating educational settings that are responsive to student needs. I am assuming that the primary measure of power and authority is the degree of involvement in the decision-making process.

As Victor Baldridge has written, what is needed are policy strategists who can focus on system-level needs, values, and problems, and the larger goals of the organization. In this context, the student affairs administrator would perform the role of articulating student and institutional needs, facilitating change in relation to these needs, building learning environments and allocating resources in relation to defined objectives and needs.

What skills are required to function as policy strategist and learning environmentalist?

- (1) Again, student affairs administrators must have a clear sense of educational philosophy and learning theory.
- (2) They must have the ability to assess student needs and characteristics and the quality of the learning environment.

- (3) They must have the skill to interpret the data gathered and to present it in a clear, cogent manner in the decision-making process.
- (4) They must also focus on the process of decision-making to make sure that it facilitates effective decisions. More specifically, they must make sure that the process permits the quality of interaction, exchange of ideas, and flow of information necessary to make wise decisions. Campus administrations cannot make consistently good decisions without good processes.
- B. Once the decisions related to goals, policies, priorities, and program have been made, there are critical administrative or management functions that must be performed to execute the decisions. The best decision can go for naught without proper implementation.

Effective execution involves the organization and utilization of human talent. To render effective service in these rubrics, administrators must have greater knowledge of human relations and competence to maximize human output. The higher the involvement of staff and the greater confidence and trust expressed in them, the higher the morale and in turn the greater the output. Obviously, activities can be organized in many different ways, but the important factor that cannot be missing is staff involvement and a supervisor-staff relationship that involves trust and confidence. This requires delegating, taking risks, and working at involvement.

The administrative side of student affairs work is increasingly important. As institutions are forced to better manage resources in the face of tight budgets, presidents must seek competent administrators. Too often, the key administrative jobs do not go to student affairs people because they seem to lack the necessary perspective and skill or have been "used up" in control jobs. Too often student affairs administrators are seen as persons who can work with students or provide services, but who lack the capacity for high-level administration.

There is need for persons at high administrative levels who understand student needs and learning theory, and student affairs administrators should be able to combine such knowledge with sound administrative theory and practice. I wonder if too much emphasis has been placed on crisis management, counseling, and program development and too little on how to facilitate learning in complex organizational settings. Both the educational and management aspects of student affairs work must be emphasized. It is possible to have a primary educational thrust and to also be good administrators but it takes preparation, insight, and hard work. It is a prodigious challenge to move beyond the administrative trivia, and to place primary emphasis on the larger issues related to goal setting, policy formulation, resource allocation, and program development and evaluation—but it can be done.

C. Time also must be found for the direct educational functions of teaching and counseling, even though in larger organizations, this is difficult to achieve. Without this involvement it is easy to lose touch with students and to misjudge changes required in the teaching-learning process.

V. CONCLUSION

In summary, what is needed for viability as a student affairs administrator?

Student affairs administrators must press for a role that involves much more than control, discipline, and administration of services. They must strive for a role that places

primary emphasis on involvement in the decision-making process, development of the learning environment, assessment and interpretation of student needs, and effective execution of policy and program decisions. This will require greater understanding of administrative and management theory as well as learning theory.

They must acquire knowledge of research methodology so that they can assess student needs and environmental factors that impinge on learning and program effectiveness.

They must learn how to maximize utilization of human resources—to involve people meaningfully in decision-making and policy execution. Basically, they must become experts in human development—educators whose special insights, knowledge and skills permit them to contribute in unique ways to the development of learning situations.

To perform the roles of policy strategist, learning environmentalist, facilitator, educator, and administrator, great knowledge and skill are required but there are also some essential personal qualities; that is, personal commitment, loyalty, a clear sense of values and philosophy, judgment, integrity, consistency, courage, toughness when necessary, and great sensitivity. To be effective, student affairs administrators also must have the capacity to withstand extreme pressures, to make decisions in the face of conflict and uncertainty, to live with loneliness and misperceptions of effectiveness and values by others, and to accept failure and criticism. Moreover, they must have the stamina to meet heavy workload requirements; that is, they must be able to handle all the administrative details and also be creative, bright, alert, incisive, considerate, and nice to students, alumni, parents, trustees, and the president, and after 60 hours of such behavior, to still find time for the family, church, community, research, writing, professional development, and NASPA conferences. Basically, they must have the qualities of Moses, Solomon, Hercules, and Jesus Christ, and of course, it would be helpful to be able to walk on water.

Student affairs administrators can play a vital role as institutions change and respond to new conditions—a role that possibly no one else can perform or will perform. The renewed interest in revitalizing education while responding to increasingly diverse student needs, presents a great challenge, but more importantly, a great opportunity. In too many institutions faculty are retrenching rather than seeking new ways to improve learning. Too many administrators, caught in the vice of restricted funds and increased accountability, are unwilling or unable to reorder priorities to upgrade student learning. Student affairs administrators who are properly prepared are in a position to look at the total learning environment and to press for necessary changes. And if they are sufficiently skilled to articulate learning requirements at high planning levels, to organize and execute plans of action expertly and to maintain essential contact with the learning environment, their impact on the educational process can be considerable. Is such a role attainable? Is this pleasant rhetoric that has no value in practice? I think not, but the answer rests with each of us—our individual preparation, effectiveness, and commitment.

Tomorrow's Students, Tomorrow's Colleges— Who Plans?

Joseph Cosand

Higher education has been involved in a revolution for the past 27 years, ever since the veterans returned from World War II. The GI Bill triggered changes which have occured year by year with increasing rapidity and effect. We are well aware of the growth in enrollment and numbers of institutions, the increase in costs to the students and tax payers, the change from elitism to egalitarianism, the change from blind support to disenchantment and suspicion, the move up and now down in the listing of priorities, and the swing from rather arrogant complacency and smugness on our part to confusion, fear and defensiveness. Throughout this period we in the education profession have tended to act with expediency and reaction instead of planning. We have been preoccupied with growth and have measured too often our success in terms of size—size of campus, enrollments, and size of budget. There has been more than enough for everyone—and we didn't take the time to plan carefully, objectively, or cooperatively. We opened our doors but weren't sure what was inside for the expectant students. We talked about equality of opportunity, but we really didn't talk about equal access once we were inside that door. We developed new curricula and expanded existing curricula without analyzing what was being scheduled at our neighboring colleges. We took in the new students but didn't realize their pluralisms in interests, needs and abilities. We weren't too concerned with the heavy attrition because seat space was at a premium. We as staff, administrators, faculty, board members, were not seeing the totality but rather were engrossed in our own special interests — institution and department-centered rather than student-centered. We weren't looking or listening and were not ready for the change in climate which was first indicated some nine years ago in Berkeley and which came into full bloom about five years ago. We still reacted with expedience and, through our lack of analysis and planning, created a vacuum of professional leadership. All of us contributed to this, Since nature abhors a vacuum, other forces have moved in and the resultant plethora of planners has caused confusion, chaos, and dangers of external controls over what was once a diversity of hundreds of autonomous colleges and universities. We have no one to blame but ourselves. We were not prepared. We did not plan. We did not cooperate. We did not function efficiently. We were not student-centered. We were wasteful of our resources, both human and physical.

Incoming presidents, in past years, were typically recruited from academic disciplines.

Joseph Cosand is
Professor of Education at the
Center for the Study of Higher Education,
University of Michigan. He is former
Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education.

They tended to view the college in light of that prior experience. They were particularly sympathetic to the academic deans, if you will, because they themselves came out of this kind of background. Today our presidents are tending to come more and more out of the background of business management. This is also true in Washington and it is certainly true in many of our state capitals. If you will look at the leadership that affects education in Washington and examine the backgrounds of these people, you will see the business manager "type" moving into the leadership role. We've brought this on ourselves, I am convinced. It is a trend in colleges and universities where the board of trustees wants an efficient business manager to manage this very complex institution.

Where's the educator? I have argued for a long time that I felt it was possible to educate a college president about the efficiencies of business management probably far easier than it would be to do the opposite. I have a bias but I believe that the business of education requires competent educational leadership, as well as efficient management.

To return to the theme of growth errors, graduate programs grew rapidly with assistance from Washington, but without concern for the possible future surplus of graduates, graduate programs and high maintenance cost. State colleges became universities and added to the numbers of graduate programs and perhaps lessened the quality of the graduate programs themselves. Liberal arts colleges expanded heavily in enrollments and costly facilities—now a very heavy burden to maintain. In my office in Washington, the number of colleges that did this and now want moratoria on their loans for the buildings they built from loans is rather amazing. In just one midwestern state alone we had over 15 liberal arts colleges asking for moratoria on the loans that they had made to build buildings. In other words they over-reached themselves without planning. Community colleges expanded rapidly in numbers and size and too often duplicated efforts in neighboring technical institutes and low-cost public colleges and vice versa. Colleges went their own way with little or no concern for other colleges or for the totality of higher education.

Emulation, duplication, planning, management were seldom discussed seriously. Instead the words were expansion, size, new buildings, new campuses, higher salaries, lower teaching loads, new courses, etc. The costs of maintaining what had been created expanded rapidly at the expense of the students, tax payers, and voluntary donors. The percentage of the gross national product going to higher education increased from 1% to 2½% — which figure the Carnegie Commission believes to be a maximum. The "best of times" moved toward the "worst of times" and we entered the period of re-appraisal, which period may well last through the 1980's. At least this is the Carnegie Commission's prediction. The top priority bubble that we were living with burst and there has developed the following: (1) disenchantment with higher education; (2) disenchantment with student actions and demands; (3) disenchantment with faculty tenure, activities, salaries and teaching loads; (4) concern with employment prospects for college graduates; (5) growing anti-intellectualism and desire for yesterday's simplistic answers; (6) anger at increased tuition and taxes; (7) intrusion of other social needs requiring increased percentages of the gross national product; (8) demand for curricula, course and evaluation relevancy; (9) interest in non-traditional study. I could go on but we need to look at each one of those nine items. All of these have had their effect on the attitude of increasing numbers of our total population and upon many of our former supporters who are now questioning our viability.

Who has been concerned enough to act — to try to do something constructively? The Carnegie Commission for the past six years has studied the structure, function and financing of higher education and has published numerous reports and books with specific recom-

mendations. We laugh sometimes about the fact that it's going to be another six-foot shelf of books and I am sure it will. The Newman Committee shocked the higher education community with a caustic report two years ago and is now coming out with a series of ten reports of a similar caustic nature recommending change. I think Frank Newman is painting with a broad brush and I told him so but he says, "How else can I get the attention of the people?" Well, he's got a vehicle that's getting the attention of the people. Reisman and Jencks challenged higher education in "The Academic Revolution." States have created with rapidity state councils, boards, and commissions to bring higher education together. Congress passed "The Education Amendments of 1972" authorizing new terminology — post secondary education instead of higher education. The recently appointed National Commission to Study the Financing of Post-secondary Education — and I was a member until I left OE — spent two days trying to define post-secondary education. And I think really the reason that they spent so much time was because it's foreign to everything that we've believed in in the past. It includes a lot of things that we didn't use to think were respectable. But it's there. The Carnegie Commission started talking about it and when you get some of the members of the Carnegie Commission talking about expansion of the traditional higher education program you've got an interesting game going on, because Nathan Pusey, former president of Harvard, has a decided opinion of what higher education is and it does not include the word post-secondary education. The same is true of other members of the Carnegie Commission.

In addition, Congress, in the amendments, authorized state planning commissions for post-secondary education, a national commission to study the financing of post-secondary education, and a fund for the improvement of post-secondary education. Throughout these amendments there is a strong emphasis on occupational education at the expense of support for traditional higher education. In other words, there has been a revolution — but where have we been? If any of you were at the American Association of Higher Education conference, you may have heard the Representative from Minnesota, an outstanding legislator, indict us, one and all, particularly the presidents of the colleges, for not having the facts, for not planning, for not coming and educating the legislators, for remaining aloof. Now when you get that kind of verbiage from those leaders — and you know that these people are very influential leaders in Washington — it's time we listen to them and ask if their criticisms are justified. I don't think we want to say that they are justified but in the 13 months I was in Washington I heard this theme repeated over and over and over and over again from Congressmen, from Senators and from their aides. (Believe me, if you don't know their aides you should get acquainted with them. They are brilliant young people. They are making the decisions a lot of the time that come out of the mouths of the Senators and Representatives.) We have a job to do to restore our credibility for leadership and for planning rather than reacting.

Let me go back and repeat one sentence. Throughout these amendments there is a strong emphasis on occupational education at the expense of support for traditional higher education. HEW and OMB, Office of Manager of the Budget, support this philosophy, but have not seen fit to supply the necessary funding. In addition to the above interested groups, consortia of private, public, or private and public colleges have begun to attack and hopefully to cope with the complex problems facing higher education. However, these interests, if effective, must be expanded to include the broader field of post-secondary education, which encompasses proprietary institutions and technical institutions. And I think maybe this is the problem that faced the Finance Commission and faced the Carnegie Commission when they tried to define post-secondary education.

At this AAHE meeting in Chicago I shared the platform with Roger Heyns, President of the American Council on Education, and with two gentlemen who represented proprietary institutions, one of whom was head of the educational program of Bell & Howell. This educator said "we have seven institutions, we enroll a hundred thousand students, it's the biggest part of Bell & Howell, although Bell & Howell still is thought of by the public as a photography outfit." However, he said, "our education element is our biggest function now" and, he said, "we place 92% of our students in the occupations for which they came to be prepared." You could have heard a pin drop in that audience. That's a proprietary institution.

The above types of action groups are worthy of note. In looking at the totality of involvement in the vacuum we created, we see the following participants with generally limited viewpoints, vested interests, biases, and little or no coordination or over-view of the totality of higher education or of post-secondary education. And this, of course, is what I've become increasingly concerned about. Who are they?

- (1) The Federal Government: The White House; Office of Manager of the Budget, Health, Education and Welfare; Office of Education, Labor, Veterans Administration; National Institutes of Health; National Institute of Mental Health; the Defense Department; the Treasury Department, and Congress. Throughout these offices are bright, opinionated persons, some visible but most anonymous, who too often make the decisions affecting the lives of millions of students and thousands of institutions. Too often the decisions are based on vested interests, bias, and ignorance to reality. At times this verges on a dangerous area.
- (2) National organizations located primarily at One DuPont Circle: I've argued with a lot of these people and I said you can't sit here in Washington and make decisions if you don't go out and try to find out what they're thinking out in the field. I think this is fundamental. In this regard, there is a hopeful awakening, I believe, under the leadership of ACE President Roger Heynes. This may be the vehicle which can provide the initiative for a return to educational leadership by the education profession.
- (3) The state government and related organizations: education commissions for the states, the State Higher Education Executive Officers (a powerful group), state chancellors, the states' higher education and executive officers group, councils, commissions, boards, legislators, governors. Since 1960 the trend has been toward state planning and state administration. As I said earlier, four states now have secretaries of education. A reaction from college presidents and national organizations, fearful of state control, may create a confrontation. HEW itself is now concerned about the danger of the state planning commissions becoming controlling agencies. And that's why there's been a stoppage on the state planning commissions which we were working on in Washington some months ago. The fear on the part of HEW is that this would become state controlling rather than state planning.
- (4) Local and regional agencies: such as coordinating councils, consortia, boards, and informal liaison.
 - (5) The foundations.
- (6) The institutions themselves: boards, faculty, students, administration such as you represent.
 - (7) The citizens: the taxpayers, the tuition-payers, the donors, the alumni groups.

I think it is incumbent on every education leader today to take the time to sit down and go through what I've done here very briefly, to determine who is planning. I have been appalled at the numbers of groups and peoples who are doing the planning and I keep asking myself where are we in this milieu? These groups and individuals are actually involved in influencing and making the decisions which will determine the future of higher and of post-secondary education. We call ourselves professionals but we have abdicated our professional responsibility for leadership. We have been reactives. This is not true of the legal, medical, dental, engineering and science professions — so why is it true of our own? Where have we been? Why was it necessary for the Carnegie Corporation to establish a commission to study the function, structure and financing of post-secondary education? Why was it necessary for the Governor of Michigan to just recently appoint a commission to establish the goals of higher education for the State of Michigan? What is our responsibility as educational leaders? What can we or will we do?

- (1) Know what the totality of post-secondary education is in terms of the diversity of institutions needed to meet the pluralistic needs of our pluralistic students. Equality of opportunity and equal access are inseparable parts of the entitlement concept embodied in the education amendments. This concept mandates pluralism throughout post-secondary education.
- (2) Know the objectives of your college. State, emphasize and adhere to them. Also know the differing objectives of the other colleges and be mutually supportive. The goal is student success within their areas of interest, abilities and motivation. The goal can no longer be "head count" at the beginning of a college year.
- (3) Tell the total story and your special story to everyone concerned, over and over and over not defensively but factually. The people don't know it and too many believe they have been conned by institution-centered instead of student-centered faculty and administrators.
- (4) Help eliminate wasteful, unjustified curricula and duplication of curricula among institutions serving a particular program. This is one of the things, perhaps *the* one, that stuck in the craw of the legislators on the Finance Commission more than anything else. In our first meeting each person on this commission, 17 of us, made some comments and each of the four legislators hit the same thing, "When are the colleges going to stop duplicating one another's efforts and when are they going to start cooperating?" Their conclusion to this was there simply are not enough resources, either human or physical, to afford this kind of unnecessary duplication of effort.
- (5) Share the resources both human and physical with other colleges, public and private. I was asked to be a consultant to a liberal arts college in another state here some year or more ago, just before I went to Washington. This college had been running a deficit for five years, around \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year, but this coming year it was to be \$250,000. It enrolled 800 students. I asked them for some information. Following review of these materials, I wrote back and said, "You don't need me at all. You've got the data yourselves. Cope with it and make your own decisions." The data included such items as: a student-teacher ratio of 9.7-1; all undergraduate, 800 students; every department regardless of its size, has a department head who is given one-third time off for being department head. In the physics department there were one and one-half teachers and the department head got one-third time off and the total enrollment of all the physics students in all of the physics classes was 14. They still requested my visit so I spent two days with them and

they kept saying "what should we do, what would you say we do?" I said "I'm not going to tell you what to do. I'll talk with you, but can't you make your own conclusions?" About two or three weeks later I got a copy of a memorandum that was sent out to the faculty and students. It was filled with "Mr. Cosand says, Mr. Cosand says." Is my story clear? In other words, here was a college that could have made its own decisions but it was trying to do what other colleges were trying to do in the same area. I said, "Can't you share with another college and contract with another college for the education of those students who need physics?" The answer was, "But what will we do with our one and one-half teachers?" This might illustrate why business managers, who can make these decisions, are being placed into college presidencies.

- (6) Help establish a five- to ten-year master plan and update the plan annually. If you're not going to update the plan annually, don't do it because there's nothing any worse than having a five- or ten-year master plan that you adhere to religiously and not see that there have been changes during the five or ten years. Include in the plan, in order of importance; i.e.,
 - a. philosophy and objectives stated new every year.
 - b. the curricula in operation, in the planning stages, those to be phased out, and those that are being considered.
 - c. student services.
 - d. enrollment projections, by curriculum.
 - e. income projections.
 - f. expenditures projections, by curricula offerings and service rendered.
 - g. the facilities new, and those to be replaced or to be remodeled.

And if you have that kind of master plan in which you, as vice presidents or administrators in your particular field, played an important, integral part, then you've got input which you must have if the students are to be understood in terms of their needs. You are there to educate a president just the same as the academic dean is there, but you're going to have a harder time because the president generally comes from an academic discipline or now the business dean may educate him because he may come from a business background. Where are you? Are you educating that president?

I had a dean of students back in the Bay Area of California who attempted to educate me and I'll be forever thankful because he kept after me all the time. He had access, the same as the academic dean, and it was on a peer basis. It was not a hierarchy of an academic dean, down the line comes the vice president for student affairs. In other words, there was a peerage which I think is essential. And I think that if you can educate the president as this chap tried to educate me, I in turn — or your president in turn — will educate a board. He'll learn to bring you with him, or her, to the board meetings when there's something to be discussed with respect to students and he won't regurgitate something that maybe he doesn't know very much about. This might be the most important thing I can say to you this morning. Where are you with respect to your president? Where are you with respect to the comments that he makes to the board which sets the policy for your particular institution? It's essential that you be there.

(7) Be aware of and informed about the decision-makers in Washington, in your state, in the regions, in your local community, and in your institution. Help educate them

so that their decisions will more often be based on factual knowledge instead of ignorance, bias, or vested interests.

- (8) Keep your alumni and other interested friends informed through concise factual reports monthly if possible, quarterly at the least. Help them understand the totality of post-secondary education so that a climate of support for the needed diversity of the institutions can be developed and maintained. Mutual support instead of negative criticism of one another is essential in the restoration of a high respect and support for institutions of higher education. We certainly won't regain lost ground by tearing one another down in order to enroll another student. Colleges can, through mutual respect and support and through the sharing of resources, show both our critics and intruding decision-makers that we are capable of solving our own problems without controls be they state, regional, or federal.
- (9) Watch the trends and don't just let things happen. You must have an influence and a major role in the decision making which affects the students you are expected to serve with professional competence. The long trends taking shape are the following, which may have major impact upon both students and your institutions.
- a. A free marketplace. If you haven't heard about it, you should, I am sure most of you have. The philosophy is let the student have the money and take it where he or she wishes. Eliminate all aid to institutions both categorical and noncategorical. This should be recognized as a distinct trend.
- b. Provide partial grants only to low-income students and let the other financial needs of all students, including the low-income students, be met through loans.
- c. Increase in state planning and super boards with increasing administrative responsibility for all of post-secondary or higher education.
- d. Decision making in ten regional offices instead of Washington, especially on all grants and contracts.
- e. Monitoring and specific evaluation of all federal or state assistance to institutions. Very careful evaluation of monitoring the funds you receive from the state or from the Federal Government is to be the norm.
- f. The management systems with emphasis on cost accounting throughout all parts of the institution's total budget.
- g. And last, evaluation of output instead of input: college by college, department by department, services, maintenance, and so forth.

There are other trends to be noticed and studied, but the above are of importance and illustrative of my concern. Some of these are long overdue and we should have initiated these actions ourselves. We didn't and they are being moved along by other interested parties. It is our responsibility where justified. It is of even more importance that we be aware of inherent dangers in some of these trends and take active leadership to approach those trends that could destroy the autonomy, diversity and quality of our various institutions.

What has been said applies to all staff members of a college or of a university. There is no excuse for apathy or an ostrich-like attitude on the part of any faculty member or administrator or, for that matter, on the part of any board member. You in NASPA have a particularly heavy responsibility for you, supposedly, are closest to the student needs and therefore should be most cognizant of the student's interest and needs. It is absolutely

essential that you establish a closer working relationship with the instructional staff and with the other top administrative officers and to demonstrate very specific ways major contributions of student personnel staff members can link to the overall goals, objectives, and plans of the institution.

Inclusion of the previous sections of this paper is not accidental . . . Your contributions are most needed in master planning, curriculum development, in coping with trends and decision-makers, in helping guide the college to assume its particular role within the diversity of institutions. This participation may well require the development of new skills and expertise on your part, but you should have a foundation of knowledge upon which to build and assume these new roles.

There are graduate schools which give emphasis to the roles you will increasingly play in the overall planning of the college. However, the skills and expertise as well as the necessary courage to innovate, to evaluate and to seek new paths for student achievement can be acquired only through continuous in-service education. Your role has tremendous potential, but if you don't assume it and instead play only a minor part in the total action, your responsibilities will be picked off one by one and assigned elsewhere. In this day of intrusions in the vacuums, you too are vulnerable and expendable. The old role of student personnel officers has disappeared into a much greater complexity of student services. No one is more aware of this than are you. Where do you fit into the picture? And what are you doing to prepare yourself for tomorrow's colleges?

Earlier I mentioned the expansion of interest in occupational and career education. There is also a strong movement towards non-traditional studies, continuing and/or recurrent education and the external degree. The head-count figure isn't as important as it used to be. You have a substantial contribution to make in this new revolution (along with a change to post-secondary education). There is also the rapidly expanding field of cooperative work-experience programs combined with long-range and short-range occupational goals. There's a thrust that Clark Kerr has pushed, the Carnegie Commission has pushed; the "stop out" where a person stops out for a while and then comes back and continues throughout his or her life for life-long learning. Where are we in that? Where is your college in that?

Paul Reinert, President of St. Louis University, a great educator, has been doing everything in his power to make St. Louis University change to cope with this new world. The last time I was with Paul he said, "You know, Joe, in St. Louis we found a whole area of needs that we haven't even known existed." He referred to the part-time continuing student and said, "the first step we made brought in 350 students who needed help but whom we had never touched before."

As minorities enter our institutions, are we really prepared to serve them, or are we letting them to the doors and not having anything that would give them equal access to opportunity. These are the things we have to work at; if we don't, somebody else will.

Have you accepted the challenges of these developments? In meetings I've had with legislators, as I said earlier, and members of the executive branch of government, the consensus is very strong that you have not. That you still adhere to the traditional and that you resist change.

It is difficult for me to accept this criticism. You of all college professionals, you who are the closest to the students must assume forward-looking leadership. You must be prepared to probe the fringes of change in order to help the total college cope with the educa-

tional problems brought about by our expanded appeals to new students who enroll regardless of age, race, interest or lack of affluence. You are the ones who have to help educate the faculty members who are teaching the disciplines and the administrators (your own group included). This heterogeneity requires a diversity of institutions in terms of curriculum, selectivity and cost. We cannot equate "equality of opportunity" and "equal access" in terms of equal institutions. Nothing could be worse. Diversity is essential but you in NASPA must understand and support this concept in working with the students to help them find achievement and satisfaction socially, economically and culturally.

Our motto can and must be "Each person's success enriches us, each person's failure diminishes us — individually, institutionally and throughout society as a whole."

Thank you for the privilege of being with you this morning.

Futuristic Modes and Models In Human Relations

Jeanne Noble

It is certainly more nearly possible to predict future modes in science and technology than in human relations. The obvious reason, of course, is that we spend billions and billions of dollars becoming world leaders in technocracy and very little in the arena of human concern and human relations. A good case can be made for the notion that science and technology actually dictate current prevailing human relationship patterns.

The first steps toward change in our country come with some mechanical or scientific breakthrough and in the wake of such discovery new patterns of human relationship usually evolve.

The birth-control pill serves as an excellent example. This pill really did bring on the sexual revolution, not a change in attitude. Girls became as involved as boys in sexual matters; puritanism and sexual abstinence were replaced for many by freedom of choice for both sexes. We could even go a step further and say that the pill liberated women to be concerned about women in liberation. I wouldn't say that's the only contributing factor, but that scientific pill certainly played a part.

Let's consider a scientific breakthrough with negative implications for Blacks. A while back we all hailed the new behavior modification drugs as helpful with violent mental patients in institutions. One day, however, civil rights organizations woke up to discover that in some schools across the nation ghetto children, usually Black boys, were given these drugs to control so-called violent behavior. In many cases insensitive teachers, according to studies, are sometimes just frightened when they see a Black boy run across the room. In many cases these teachers labeled normal, aggressive, Black boys as violent. Can we look down the road and predict what studied growth patterns will develop as a result of altering behavior through pills? Science really does dictate in our country, and human relationships seem secondary in interest and programmatic concern.

Furthermore, America, for all its rhetoric about brotherhood, its claim of liberty and justice for all, its enshrining of democratic principles, is more a technocracy than a democracy. We, as a nation, are not committed to the lofty goals, printed in human relations text books, such as shared leadership, participatory democracy, human potential development, openness in communication, shared power, collaborative leadership, — all of the ascendency values of human relations to which most of us in this field are committed and

Jeanne Noble is
Professor of Education,
Division of Human Relations,
New York University; and,
Executive Vice President,
National Council of Negro Women.

dedicated. Americans just don't want to be hassled. One woman was heard to say after three days of watching television and being confronted with the Wounded Knee trials and tribulations, "Haven't they settled that Indian mess yet? I'm sick of hearing about it." Maybe President Johnson was right when he told Bill Moyers, his protege, "What most people want is a rug on the floor or a picture on the wall and music in the house." The human relations mold which influenced relationships between differing groups in the late '60's and early 70's is rapidly changing — not because attitudes have changed or because we have advanced a social engineering plan to structure different constructive realationships in the human arena, but because of non-humanistic factors. It doesn't take long to "dig" Roberta Flack's song "Trying Times is What the World is Talking About, You've Got Confusion All Over the Land." It has neither become moral for America to deal for the right to play with human relations nor is it any longer interesting, "chic" or the "in" thing. The wiping out of many social programs built upon cash incentives and/or pay-offs to benefit minorities, (Blacks especially), has concurrently wiped out our concern.

By way of further introduction, the term "human relation" needs some defining or delimiting. I've grown accustomed to people defining all of the interpersonal problems we face in society as the rightful province of human relations. Some people have suggested marital problems, sister-sister problems, sister-brother problems, and many others. Of course, these are human problems, but they are the rightful study of other disciplines. The academic and practical field of human relations, as I view it, is perhaps best labeled "social relations." As a field of scholarly inquiry and practice it is our business to apply knowledge from the behavioral and political sciences to societal group problems. We deal with group conflict and resolution and institutional functioning or disfunctioning due to the differences posed by the varied sociological groups having to live alongside one another in this country.

The goal of the human relations to which I am giving attention should be group conflict resolution, shared power, participatory democracy, and institutional harmony for groups which are usually differentiated by race, class, generations, or sex. Many people in our country will define human relation's education or human relation's interests as all personal relationships between human beings. Sometimes people say, "I'm just a human being and I look upon every other person as a human being." There really is no such thing as a human being so long as society is as dysfunctioning as this one is without first facing up to those ingredients that go into making a person a human being. Among the ingredients would be included those that make him or her unique among all other human beings. But as long as we speak about "the people" or "We are all humans together" or "I see everybody alike regardless of race, creed, color or sex," and pretend that there are no problems that occur in our society due to the fact that some groups are different in color and experience as in the case of Blacks or the sexes, we will escape between the horns of the dilemma. By labeling everything "human" we sandpaper down the ugly problems that come from people really treating individuals differently because of their membership in certain groups.

Now to turn to a key premise for successfully resolving human relationship problems — we must recognize the solutions rest more with institutional and sociological variables, not individual and psychological. The point of great import here relates to an important futuristic mode of human relationships. I fear that human relationship problems will increasingly be redefined to appear more psychological, more interpersonal than sociological and few solutions will be realized. Tinkering with the psyche will be more acceptable than dealing forthrightly with institutional change and power redistribution which I contend is the real "gutsy" issue of human relations. As long as group problems can be individualized and kept

in the psychological arena they will pose no threat. It is when we professionals begin to raise questions about institutional change and demonstrate that we must learn to work effectively with groups that we become a threat to the status duo. Consider this—psychiatry and psychology are safe in America today (unless you want to run for the vice presidency). Who cares what we do with individuals. One by one we can build one hundred thousand cubicles across the length and breadth of this land and the leaders will not be bothered at all. It's when one and one makes two, and two plus two makes four, and a group emerges from this equation, that everybody becomes up-tight. I've been critical of the lack of sociological courses taken by counselors and student personnel workers. We're up to our necks with psychology credits, in the 60's we have been too individually oriented, too dedicated to face change without being concerned with group life or group dynamics. As a professional we've been the sorters and stuffers of youth as our testing abilities took wings and just grew and flourished in the land. As deans we were caretakers of the establishment and not advocates of the student interest. Early in the 60's, did any of us demonstrate that we have the skills to work effectively with students who really did have some just grievances? To our horror across the nation we — student personnel administrators, most of us — were part of the questions being raised by the students, and scarcely the answer.

In addition to the problem of defining human relationship problems too frequently as individual rather than institutional, there also appears to be a stepping up of the negative influence of what I call the "redefinition phenomena." Recently, the New York Times reported that a Federal and inter-agency committee is examining the possibility of doing away with the Federal use of the word "poverty." The government is probably embarrassed by the fact that the numbers of poor folks in America have begun to climb again after a decade of decline. By including food stamps, medicare, subsidized housing, adding these all together and coming up with the salary package, it is intended thereby that the raising of the level of income would define poverty out of existence. The article quotes one official as saying, "Poverty is a value-laden, highly politicized word, and that's not the kind of word we like. We would like a less value-laden concept devoid of emotional complications." Patrick Movnihan stated a doctrine of benign neglect which stressed the redefinition of poor among four recommendations to President Nixon. The four peripheral remedies that, I believe, were urged upon President Nixon by Mr. Moynihan were: (1) Deny that the Black poor exist, thereby diminishing the legitimacy of their unrest. Stress those things that distinguish large portions of the population as something living apart from the rest. (Interestingly, by February 1970 OEO lower staff had already dropped the use of the word "poor" in referring to people without money or power.) (2) Maintain the rate of economic expansion which steadily improves the lot of Negroes, mostly the middle class, but which also keeps down White dissatisfaction at a time of Black-cultural alienation, (3) Keep Black problems out of the news, de-escalate the rhetoric of problems about the internal state of the society in general. (4) Avoid personal identification with Vietnam and keep the establishment kids off your back by letting the Black poor do the fighting overseas. By a series of new definitions, middle Americans really think that Blacks are better off than they are.

As we face the future, will we redefine human relations problems out of existence and not even begin the process of tackling them? Even as I raise these questions there is another truth which we will have to monitor as we anticipate the years ahead. Many of us have suggested that we will face an escalation of rhetoric concerning conflict of interests between two or more oppressed groups. In other words, it will not be a conflict of interests between the "haves" and the "have-nots," the oppressed against the oppressed. Witness the way middle Americans are pitted against Blacks. A couple of years ago we were told by Time

Magazine that the man of the year is the Middle American. In this article we were told that the forgotten Americans, the middle Americans, were the most important neglected group in the country and that it was time that they had their say and share. Newsweek somewhat later funded a poll of this group and asked, "Do Negroes today have a better chance or a worse chance than people like yourselves?" 49% of them said "yes" — Blacks have a better chance to get well-paying jobs; 41% said "yes" — they have a better chance to get a good education for their children (this was before the bussing phenomenon); 45% said "yes" — they have a better chance to get housing at a reasonable cost and 65% of them thought that Blacks had a better chance to get financial help from the government. The facts simply don't support one single, solitary statistic projected. For example, the dollar gap between Blacks and Whites has worsened. By comparing national income means, the gap was \$1560 in 1950; by 1970 it had escalated to \$3359.

The Women's Liberation movement is another example of "divide and conquer." Betty Friedan is battling feminist leaders left and right and flaming the movement with lesbian scares — a phony issue with little to do with the just rights of women. Time magazine included me in an interview with several Black women. I was presented as if I was an anti-women's liberator and pro-Muslim. The truth is that there are more Black women than White women committed to the goals for women's liberation. That doesn't mean that they are joining the movement actively so that their pictures are seen in the newspapers. When reviewing life goals, however, the correlation is clear. Black women are at least as committed to the goals of women's liberation as most White women are as a group. And yet we are constantly being told that Black women and White women are fighting like dogs because they don't agree on anything. With only one exception, that concerning interracial marriages (we don't think White women should have access to the brothers), there is no fight.

Another consideration for future human relationships has to do with the training required to knit together the concepts of participatory democracy, collaborative decision making and shared power. Several experts have stated that the problems facing troublesome poor Black children were "powerlessness." By the early 60's the struggle for power to get a piece of the action was considered a legitimate quest for minorities. You will remember that the maximum feasible participation of the poor was mandated by the early Office of Economic Opportunity and this brought many poor people into decision-making circles of America. They were given a share in deciding the fate of their own poverty programs. but what happened? Many programs recruited these new participants whose opinions had never been asked before in their lives except by researchers who wanted to study them. They were admitted but shared none of the know-how of running things and none of the real power. Failure was "programmed" into enough poverty programs dealing with the disenfranchised across the country that the way was payed for the current administration to condemn the whole idea and say that the poor and the Blacks messed up everything and were never capable of participating on such a level and so, of course, had to be led by those who are trained specifically in the ways of bureaucracy. Real access to power requires better training experiences — particularly in the strategies for institutional change.

Here are just a few more bellwether points: In the days of student unrest, students were given rights and places on committees and boards, but soon we overloaded them, sometimes purposefully, I think. The authoritarians were able to say, "I knew all along students should not be given any power, they aren't ready for it." In cities like New York, for example, special places have been provided for Blacks and Puerto Ricans in compensatory

programs. Little help, however, has been forthcoming to aid these newly immigrant students to succeed in college or to develop new leaders to assist the city. In other words, their failure was already programmed at the beginning. Again this enables the authoritarians to say, "I knew they were 'dummies' in the first place—even with the chance they fall flat on their faces."

Of course the grafting of Blacks individually as well as Black studies programs onto the average university like barnacles onto a ship is another speech for another place. All too often the "Black add-on syndrome," the "payola system to hush up the niggers," is the modern-day version of the Saturday night fish-fry which the masters scheduled for the colored to keep them happy and out of mischief.

The most telling example of the demise of shared power, of participatory demoncracy as viable human relations objectives, is the resistance of universities—the so-called avant garde of the most humanistic thinking in the world—to accept the Affirmative Action guidelines developed by the government designed to recruit and promote Blacks and women. I believe that Affirmative Action as a human relations strategy for bringing about shared power has been abandoned across the face of this land. As I was saying to a good friend of mine down front, "We've got to face up to one thing. Last year Blacks were not in and they are still not in this year. This year women are not in and they won't be in next year." What with the job market contraction and White males threatened by any notion of preferential treatment to qualified Blacks, minorities and women, Affirmative Action has literally died. Some may not call it dead—they may say, "We can't find qualified ones, or we want only young ones, or there are no jobs here." Whatever the reason — Affirmative Action is as dead as last year's New York Times. All of this re-emphasizes that the goal at stake is a redistribution of power (including status and prestige) and there are no acceptable guidelines or principles.

The essential problem then—the most urgent issue in human relations—continues to be one of powerlessness. It is powerlessness that is the critical and crucial problem of human relations — not consciousness. Consciousness raising to teach higher levels of humanism is only an important and necessary means toward the real human relations goal —shared power—but we must never lose sight of the goal—shared power. Rollo May says that "power and innocence are essential in all living things." It (power) means being able to affirm oneself individually as one who can be, cope, feel; to be able to affirm oneself collectively in membership and in concert with others in one's reference group; to have the tools, the time, the will, and the space to influence others, to change things, account for something significant as measured by what is highly valued as good, best, right, correct; to be noticed in the here and now; to be reckoned with, dealt with, to win sometimes. This is what human relationships among groups in this country is all about.

Certain writings, The Greening of America, The Making of a Counter Culture, and others, have created positive human relations models pointing toward an evolving new man who would be more gentle, humanistic, nuturing and caring in the future. These counterculture advocates object to those of us who go around saying that we have to think about a redistribution of power. They begin by saying that power within the present context is so corrupt that they don't even want to deal with the whole notion of power. They want to deal with the development of the more humanistic person who lives outside the power structure. I think that we need to face the facts that many Blacks are sympathetic with these humanistic dreams, but few of us are so innocent as to strategize and conceptualize a better life through consciousness raising. Charles Reich, author of The Greening of America, is

morally persuasive when he deemphasizes, for example, status-oriented work. Yet the reality of power in the here and now is that Blacks have first to enter the power structure as it is with all its hang-ups and from that position work on an equal level with Whites to raise consciousness. The result may be that we all together see that being a domestic is just as valuable as being the head of Continental Can. Let's make one thing abundantly clear, the human potential movement including sensitivity training, encounter groups, the values of counter-culture and the Greening of America are useful in considering models for good human relations. But the goal of creating gentle and more loving human beings who are liberated and free to build their own philosophy and values and life style must include an action phase where liberated individuals collect enough power to bring about change in the oppressive institutions of this country instead of running away from the problem created by corrupt power, To do one's own thing, one must become free enough inside, yes, but then there's a next step to be taken, free to avidly mobilize, strength to overcome the force of oppression. Romping about in the fields of Woodstock, grooving on rock music, making love, not war, and refusing to unite one's own humanism may produce little change. To take the will to fight for justice away in any kind of humanizing or human relations system is to consciously divert the rage which comes from powerlessness and does not lead to the sense of responsibility that actual power ought to entail. Many of us are now observing the inaction on campus after campus. We are asking, "What happened to all of those young White radicals?" Well they are somewhere in the clover, bushes, or something. But wherever it is they have gone, their retrenchment from confronting the issue on a more global plane, has led to further alienation between Blacks and Whites on campuses, Blacks have grown to see the counter-culture values and the advocates of it not as allies for social change but freak-outs or cop-outs, and perceive their innocence about shared power as destructive. A consciousness raised cannot change the institutions. What good is it to those who are oppressed by these institutions and for whom there are no options? Reich says that "the very existence of power is evil." That statement alone in that book, which was read by millions, is shockingly misleading and naive.

The other problem with consciousness raising as a human relation's goal is that Reich and others all too often oversimplify and romanticize the beauty of Black literature, music and the so-called earthy lifestyle we have developed because we were creatures of oppression. To quote him, "Unquestionably," he says "the Blacks make a substantial contribution to the origin of the new consciousness. They were left out of the corporate state and thus they had to have a culture and life-style of oppression to the state." Notice that he seldom mentions that we also had to develop social and political strategy to try to get a piece of the action. He only wants to deal with the life-style that we have developed. "Their music," he says "with its guts . . . Contrast it to insipid White music. Their way of life seemed more earthy, more sensual than that of the Whites. They were the first to scorn the establishment and it gave new impetus to this awareness of the beat generation." Now this kind of romantic mystic of compensatory strength and copeability has led some White students into make-believe poverty. They go around wearing dirty, grubby clothes and sleeping around in slum conditions. One has only to remember, however, that if they get tired of being dirty and sneaking around in slums they can go on out to Scarsdale and sleep in a king-size bed. But all this is done in the name of this search for humanity which the misguided say is something that Blacks learned by having had to live in slum conditions. Blacks would like clean clothes and adequate housing. Many have demonstrated that it is quite possible to make beautiful music, write plays from a base of cleanliness and an adequate income. Certainly people under stress do indeed develop special strengths and we Blacks have made gigantic contributions to America born of a sense of tragedy and empathy so often lacking among Whites. But few of us would advocate replicating slavery for Whites in order to humanize them.

Blacks quarrel with encounter groups, touch, sensory excursions and other human potential movements from a different base than that often mounted by the power elite. Certain establishment groups have criticized sensitivity training and see in this human potential movement the seeds of Communism and, to add fuel to the fire, business and industry's studies discovered that many very fine young executives whom they sent off for this kind of training, came home, walked away from their desks, and decided that they would go off to Woodstock or some similar kind of place. Furthermore, school systems wanted sensitized teachers to raise students' test scores, not change the institutional structure in which they taught.

Now here is the point—the human relations' strategies for America were considered all right as long as individuals did their own non-embarrassing things. But any collective action including the power of new language, words, verbal confrontations won disfavor. Today there is scarcely a school system left that dares to deal with sensitizing teachers and few of them will admit an interest in the affective domain of education. Most of us are busy learning about management-by objective systems and feeling very powerless if we are not experts in computer science. Check out the list of funded projects in the Office of Education and you will see we are fast moving away from accepting the humanization of the species as a viable goal of education.

Blacks quarrel with the human potential movement, because of its incompleteness, because it fails to take the next step. Most programs stop short of institutional reform and say nothing about real system change. My own research suggests that Blacks in T-groups often felt some gain in power through verbal assault on Whites—assaults which were turned off in training experiences which acted as a diversionary arena to get rid of righteous indignation. Time would have perhaps been better spent trying to get something concrete realized in the community. In other words, when talked out it was hard for Blacks to pick up and work for institutional change. As one of my students said, "I need my anger in order to press for significant changes in institutions, not to tell a White person that he is a racist."

Unless the human potential movement recognizes that innocence and powerlessness must be transformed into an acknowledgement of constructive power realignment among groups, persons might feel liberated, but society remains unchanged. And yet I'm sure that all of us will admit that something anew flourished in the land in those days of consciousness raising and human potential development. And I, for one, a human relationist, regret its passing away. We had begun in many, many places to look at each other across the lines which divide us and to say, "I am you and you are me. What have we done to each other?" We have begun the process of getting acquainted—Black and White. Irene Pappas in Media said it so eloquently and so well, "I bring my life out in the streets so that you, the women of this land, will not think I am arrogant." Peoples' eyes are prejudiced before they get to know a stranger's heart. I would hope that somewhere along the line, as a profession, we would recapture the best about the consciousness raising movement and move it further along. Its quest for openness and communication for honesty and relationships and for relatedness was worthwhile. There must continue to be techniques and strategies which strip away the ivory tower of lies and ignorance about Blacks and other minorities. These must be replaced with realties about one's self and about one's country and about the new existence which must increasingly come to be for people who are different, who live here

together. Only through a movement like the human potential movement can we even begin to help people to discover who they really are and help them become aware of racism and humanism and other isms. And so one value to be realized in the future is to recharge the human potential movement but this time not only to humanize but also to build in strategy at the same time for institutional change.

I have dwelt with the problem of power and powerlessness and in its place any future restructuring of human relations, Because many of us, vice-presidents and deans, full professors and those who have somehow made it in the system, probably act out of a belief that power is corrupt, that politeness and servility must govern human relationships, and that patience on the part of the outsiders (women, Blacks, whoever) is a part of the way the game is played, the power of aggressive action on the part of the disenfranchised is seldom seen by us as constructive. We have, many of us, a very weak loading capacity for conflict. The social sciences have told us over and over that conflict can be creative, it can be cleansing, it can be clarifying, it can be a tool for helping us to come together as equals. We are too quick, those of us with high positions, to depend on the toughness of the law and order variety to keep our campuses cool. The absence of riots ought not to be the only goal for human relations among differing groups. Positive interaction among groups should be the goal. For this to happen, people must face their humanity in often very painful ways, as in an encounter group. But more urgently we must come to know that there must be a dedication on our part to a realignment of power in our institutions (even if we lose some of our power and prestige). We must deal forthrightly with the impotence felt by several groups: Blacks, women, Chicanos, and others; and this impotence does not always make them come off as polite, as nice. People are strategizing for a piece of the action. It may look as if it's underground now but it won't be there for long. Our response as eductional leaders should be to move equitably to let them in. Not move to co-op the leaders, redefine the problem away, pit one group against the other. If we are to avoid the numbness of Orwell's state, a state of mechanized non-feeling, then we must be prepared for the fury of groups working out their conflicts in loud and sometimes violent ways. We must see violence as a sense of powerlessness and a refusal to deal with power as the core factor in human relations. Pseudo-innocence is a luxury we cannot afford. As Marvin Bugle wrote, "We cannot avoid using power, cannot escape the compulsion to afflict the world. So let us with caution and indiction—love powerfully."

Organizational Change Processes: A Political Systems Approach

J. Victor Baldridge

This is a day of increasing criticism of bureaucracies and the frameworks within which we work. It is a period when social experiences of every kind are being criticized by those in power. President Nixon says that the social experiments of this past generation have not worked. To some extent the terrible fact is that he's right. Though our evaluations are incomplete, we claim to have re-evaluated such experiments and found that they didn't work.

Higher education is but a single example of institutions under fire from the larger society. The educational establishment in all of its manifestations is being buffeted by external forces. It's got a budget crisis on its hands; it's just gone through the students' revolution. Yet welfare establishments also are being attacked, the educational establishment is being attacked, the medical establishment is being attacked, the service agencies of every kind are being buffeted by external forces.

Given that we're enmeshed in this web of institutional structures and institutional framework, one of the major problems that constantly arises is to discover ways and means to change them to make them more responsive so that the criticisms that are buffeting those institutions can be met head-on — rather than by sidestepping them as we so often try to do. Can we accept at least temporarily the notion that some of the criticisms are valid and learn by them? This brings us to the question of organizational change. Given that we have institutions that are unresponsive, that are not meeting the needs of the society, an educational institution that's grown encrusted and entrenched in its own value system, what kind of institutional mechanism can we bring to bear to break through and change the institutions in which we are enmeshed?

I wish to consider three aspects of organizational change. First, I want to talk about a vision. What do we want to change? Second, I want to talk about the nature of the institution within which we're functioning — a miniature political system. And third, I want to talk about the tactics for change. How do we go about changing the institutions in which we live? So let me look at each of those three things.

First, the vision. What is it that we should be changing? What is it about our institutions that we should be trying to reframe and rework and restructure? Unfortunately, I can't tell you the answer to this. Each situation is unique, each institution is unique, each value structure in which the institution functions is a different environment. I can't come up with a list of simple things that you should try to change in your institution.

Let me, instead, establish a framework by which you can identify needs requiring

J. Victor Baldridge is Assistant Professor, Education and Sociology, Stanford University

changes in your institution. I often am invited to talk about institutional change at some place or another. I often wonder what it all means. What do people mean when they ask me to talk about institutional change? Usually the groups are somewhat smaller than this so I start the discussion much differently. I start by asking, "If you could change your institution, what would you change?" I suggest people make a list and then we review this list.

When I ask public school teachers what they want to change — what do you think they say? They want better salaries, they want smaller classes and lighter teaching loads. What else? They want more teaching aids, more passive students if possible. Better students, I believe, is the way they phrase that. They want more decision-making power and less evaluation—they don't want anybody evaluating them. That's a good list when you actually ask the teacher "what do you want changed?"

When you ask professors "what do you want changed" you get the higher education version of the same. They are interested in more academically oriented students — not this thing of quiet and passive. They want lighter work loads. They don't want any evaluation.

What do you ask doctors? Well doctors want less medicare patients, they want more free time. They want less government escalation.

Factory workers want less supervision, more free time, more pay (everybody wants more pay).

Let's see if we can't extrapolate from this a little. If we ask people what they want to change in their institutions — what we find is a series of extremely self-serving, restricted visions of what institutional change ought to be like. It never ceases to shock a group of teachers if you say that teachers are the last group in the world who are going to make changes in public schools. It never ceases to shock a group of professors if you say the last people in the world who are going to make the changes in the institutions are professors. If you ask physicians who is going to make the big change or be the agent they say "physicians" — which is just so much "malarkey." What I'm trying to say is that the visions of change that most of us articulate for our institutions are extremely restricted. They're almost never apple-cart upsetting kinds of goals. They're almost always self-serving and limited-vision kinds of goals.

Remember the famous quotation by Secretary of Defense Wilson, in President Eisenhower's administration, who said, "What's good for General Motors is good for the nation." What's good for the teachers is good for the students. What's good for professors is good for the university. What's good for the university, what's good for student personnel, or school administrators is good for the students. Fundamentally, whenever we talk about change what we mean is "to make life easier for me." It's one of the most difficult things to try to talk about. And one of the things that is best to ask people when you talk about change is "What do you want to change?" Most people don't want any change or if they want change, they want only the kind of change that will make a little bit of life more comfortable for me and my people.

I'm trying to argue that there is an entrenched trend among professionals who govern most of the service organizations of the country. They are simply not interested in change! Physicians are not interested in changes in the health service deliveries system in this country. Professors are simply not interested in institutional change in higher education because it is fundamentally a gigantic "rip-off" in which professors can have one of the nicest lives available in the society. Social workers are sometimes anxious for change in the social service system but primarily to make their lives more comfortable, to reduce

case loads, etc. The human services organizations in this society, and in every society I suppose, are now so entrenched as a group of professionals in a type of professionalism, in a conservative format of professionalism, that it is almost impossible to bring about change in those institutions so that the clients, not the professionals, are served. Some of you view student personnel services, for the first time, moving toward genuine professionalism. If that means professionalism in the way the professionalism has been moving in this country—protective, entrenched, self-serving professionalism—then I'm aghast that you're becoming professional. This indictment may or may not be true—but look around.

If we were to have serious change and not merely self-serving, professionally oriented kinds of change, what kinds of change would they be? Let me make a short list.

- (1) The institutions should serve the clients. We should fundamentally be interested in serving the clients that we're working with, rather than necessarily serving the profession of which we're members.
- (2) We should never assume that when we're trying to change an institution we can easily assess needs to be changed. Problem definition is always an important first step in institutional change. In this regard, the problem in some instances is one of human relations - infighting, persons not talking to each other, responding to their own needs only. The whole human relations school has for years argued that organizational change comes through fundamentally changing attitudes of individual people. I believe that, but I believe the process is considerably more involved. I believe that frequently it's a very complex mix of political dynamics which brings about change in institutions. So what should we change we should change things that will serve the clients better. To do this we should make structural changes in the institution as much as possible; it is not enough to change attitudes. Attitudes change very quickly and they also change back very quickly. Unless we support attitude change with institutional change, for example, any improvement will be short-lived. You can persuade a professor that he ought to teach better. You can run propaganda campaigns and teacher of the year awards but if you don't change the evaluation system in an institution (teaching as a prime criteria for tenure) then I guarantee you change little. What I mean then is that you should change structural situations, structural constraints, in such a fashion that attitudes and structure support mesh with each other.
- (3) Finally, we should have changes that have political feasibility. We should have changes that can mold and push people to form political coalitions that actually carry out the changes. One of the major problems with organizational change is that everybody talks about it but nobody does anything. This is primarily because most people don't know how to do anything about it. Consequently we get stuck with the same things we've always had and we end up with almost no vision of what the institution could become and almost no tactic for bringing about the change.

Let me summarize what I've said thus far. I've said that the human services institutions in this society are probably entrenched with a conservative professionalism that makes it almost impossible for them to really serve the clients that they are supposed to be serving. This I suspect is true of student personnel services as well as the other areas of human service organizations.

Secondly, I'm arguing that most professionals simply do not have any vision of organizational change because they can't see beyond their own noses; because fundamentally the kind of changes that we want to make are not serious changes. They're changes that will make our lives a little bit easier but will not necessarily make the services that we render

better or the societal functions that we carry out more receptive. It's that kind of indictment, my friends, that actually does stick from the larger society. Further, I've indicated that structural changes in the institution are frequently required and we must be concerned about changes which can be implemented through coalitions of persons in the institution.

Having said that, let's talk about the kind of institution that a university or college is. What kind of institution is it that we're dealing with? It is a very strange, unusual conglomerate kind of institution. It is not simply a bureaucracy; it is much more complex. Let me note a few characteristics of the universities and colleges that make them different from other kinds of organizations. One of the problems of organizational theory is that it tends to place all kinds of organizations under the same blanket — it doesn't discriminate among them. Let me point out some things that I think are different about colleges and universities than the post office, the local business firm or General Motors.

- (1) It's a client-serving, people organization. It's not making things; it's helping to make people.
- (2) It is goal diffuse. What's the goal of the university? What's the goal of the college? It is to teach, do research, make citizens. It's also nuclear physics, it's also making the atom bomb, it's also doing a lot of other things. It's goal diffused and one of the problems of decision making and change in such an institution is that one can always justify anything. Whatever you're doing you can say it's part of the goal of the university.
- (3) It's technologically diffuse. Given a messy goal structure, without precision, then much of the time you don't know how to implement such goals. The problems with technological diffusion are that it leads to fadism. If you don't know what you're doing, if you don't know how to counsel students, how to make life relevant to students, then what are you going to do? You go around chasing all of the new fads. Why do we have all of this fad-chasing routine — because we don't know what we're doing. If you have a goal-diffuse organization, technology is fundamentally unclear and fadism is the order of the day. So we confuse fadism with organizational change. We confuse the latest gimmick for actually serving the client. If you don't know what you're doing, if your serving of people and your technology are unclear, who do you hire to do the work? Witch doctors, if possible! If not witch doctors, then professionals! What you actually do is hire people who supposedly have all the skills in a package, who came to graduate school with that package, and they know what to do because they're trained to do it. Of course their goals aren't clear and they don't know what they're supposed to be doing, and their technology's unclear, but they know how to do it. If you don't believe it, ask them. Now every graduate school turns out people that are ready to do it — if they only knew what it was. So they're highly professionalized.
- (4) Finally, the last general characteristic is that the college and university are vulnerable to outside influences. It is extremely permeable in the sense that the outside can "get to" colleges and universities most of the time.

In summary, higher education institutions are vulnerable . . . they're client serving, goal diffuse, with an unclear technology, highly professionalized and highly vulnerable to the outside world. Given these characteristics how does the decision-making process go on within the institutions — that's what I want to ask. An institution can't change until you ferret out the decision-making process.

The process is characterized by committees. There's a reason — bureaucracy — it's a logical outgrowth of the kind of institution that we are. Why? Because we don't know

what we're doing, it takes high expertise to do it. Therefore, committees of experts are appointed. You can never be satisfied until you have a houseful of "experts" sitting in on every matter or decision. Fundamentally, however, committees are filled with decision makers — at least amateur policy makers. You do have a full-time coterie of policy executers, officials, deans, if you please, but you also have amateur policy makers on committees who are trying to make policies, the characteristics being fluid participation and amateur decision making. Fundamentally, the committee structure leads to a fluid policy-making system in which most of the people who make the policies are not there most of the time — not on the scene with the policy most of the time.

Another characteristic of this kind of institution is that it is an "issue carrousel" — by that I mean that the issues tend to go round and round and round and they continually remerge. Constantly the same issues tend to arise over and over and over again. There's no clear decision about most things because of diffuse goals or an unclear technology, because of the fluid participating professional group. So it's obvious why we keep having those things come up — it's the nature of the institutional decision flow.

There's another process. As decisions are made there emerges a "garbage-can phenomenon." Everyone throws his pet concern into a review, so that it rides on the back of the decision that's being made. How many of you have ever started out with some simple little decision you thought was probably going to be very easy to make, and the next thing you knew you were debating the purpose of the university and the educational system in the modern society and everything in between. If you have a diffuse-goal system institution you can always throw stuff in because it's part of the legitimate goal of the university.

Well, I'm proposing a fundamental model of the university and college as a decision-making system that's considerably different from most models that we understand to be a part of complex organizations or bureaucracies. I wish to argue that we ought to treat the university as a miniature political system. It's not a bureaucracy (it may be organized anarchy), and if you think in bureaucratic terms you're dead as the change agent. Because what you do if you think in bureaucratic terms is to go to the appropriate official and try to argue with him about the appropriateness of the policy — it's that simple. The bureaucratic model calls you to do a certain kind of activity and if that's the image you have in your head that's the activity you're going to do. But I'm arguing it's not, and the tactics — if we're going to change those institutions — ought not to reflect the bureaucratic image. And if you're an organizational change agent and you think about it as a bureaucracy you're so far off base you'll never get anything done.

The second model that it's not is a collegium — the literature is full of sweet talk about how the university is a collegium — sort of an ivory tower with a group of sweet guys who sit off in the corner making intellectual philosophy. Well it is not that.

Well what is it? It's a miniature political system in which interest groups are pressuring for their definition of the goals of the institution. If the goals of the institution are not clear then you can bet they are going to be highly contestable at all times. That's step (2)—the model.

The logic of what I'm trying to argue is simple. If the diagnosis of the human services organizations is correct, and I believe it is correct, that they have become entrenched conservative, self-serving institutions that are not serving the needs of their clients, then what we must know is (1) the fundamental nature of the institution we're trying to change so that it can become more service oriented and (2) the decision processes that go on in that

institution. We had a model that governs our behavior. But then, what is our behavior, if we want to bring about a change? This might be called RULES FOR YOUNG ASPIRING MACHIAVELLIANS.

Let me make some of those rules. It's going to sound a little crass — I've been accused of being crass before about organizational change. To "soothe the psyche routine" of organizational change has never been very attractive to me. Mine is a very hard-nosed political thesis; that is, if the college or university is a political institution then you use political tactics to bring about change in the institution.

- (1) From Machiavelli never fight an issue you can't win. Never spend your chips on something you can't win. Why? Because you can always win them tomorrow. Why spend your time fighting on something that you can't win today when the issue carrousel is guaranteed to bring that issue back tomorrow. And tomorrow you may have more chips. So never fight an issue that you can't win.
- (2) Never fight without a goal in mind. Now that seems so stupid, that it shouldn't even be said. But think about what I said earlier. Most of the time when we think about change we think of little changes we think of self-serving changes I do, you do, doctors do, teachers do, so what I'm saying is, think about the kind of goal that you're espousing for your institution and think about your motives for espousing that kind of goal.
- (3) Concentrate your efforts. If you're going to be a change agent, and are going to bring about the change in this politically fluid situation at the university or the college, then you've got to concentrate your efforts on certain members and their characteristics. The guys who are there on the scene have the power every time, so "endure." There's a dissertation completed under me at Stanford by Steve Weiner, Weiner studied the public school system in San Francisco and he developed a very fundamental "stupid" thesis that I couldn't believe at first. He said the persons who are there have the power. I thought, "Now there's a dumb proposition if I ever heard one." He went to every school board meeting held over a long period of time and plotted what people said on the important topic of school integration in the city, who was there and what was the outcome. It was just absolutely crystal clear that the people who were at the meetings, consistently there time after time, were the ones who in the last analysis influenced and shaped the policy. The drop-outs, of which there were many, stood on the sidelines and harped and moaned that they didn't shape the policies. Concentrate your efforts, if you want to really bring about change, remember the kind of institution it is — it's flowing all the time and if you're there and the other people aren't there then the power flows into your hands.
- (4) Learn the history of the issue. If you know the history you are always one up because we have very short institutional time memories. We can't remember that this issue was up two years ago and we can't remember that it lost because of certain reasons. If you want to fight an issue and you want to win, obviously you have to know the history.
- (5) Machiavellian rule No. 5 build a coalition. Never be a loner. If you're going to bring change you're not going to bring it by talking to yourself; you're not going to make changes in a political institution by being a loner. You might in a bureaucratic institution, you might in a collegial institution but very, very few institutions of higher education exist which are not political systems as well. Build a coalition you can't do it by yourself.
- (6) Rule No. 6 get on a committee take some Alka Seltzers and get on the committee where the work is done. It's also done in the president's office and it's also done

in the deans' offices, it's also done lots of places — but fundamentally you've got to get on the committee and you've got to be there when the bell tolls. Be there, do your homework, remember the characteristics of the institution — it's fluid participation — with amateur decision making. Therefore, the guy who somehow did his homework is a king every time. The guy who's there and did his homework, you can bet he's going to take over the place — most of the time. Do your homework, but also fill the garbage cans. Remember I said garbage cans — the issue tends to collect a bunch of "stuff." If you are the guy running the committee and you don't want that to happen — keep the stuff out of the garbage can. If, on the other hand, you are Mr. Aspiring Machiavelli revisited, know your opponents — they'll know you — fill their garbage can. If you have any committee appointing power you can insure your opponent's fluid participation by appointing him to lots of other committees — except the one you're really interested in. So know your opponent. Use the formal system.

I have argued all along it's not a bureaucracy, but yet we all know it is. So here is one of those great paradoxes — it is not a bureaucracy but it is a bureaucracy and you know I'm lying if I say it's not and you know I'm lying if I say it is. So when it comes down — use the formal system — go where the power is on paper and raise hell. Then go back to the committee where it's not on paper and also raise hell. You'll find that by playing the two off against each other you can also make the political system work against the bureaucracy and the bureaucracy work against the political system.

(7) Finally, the last thing. If you want to be a change agent you have to follow through. One of the biggest mistakes of people who try to change institutions is they somehow think it's all over when the policy is written down on paper. Nothing could be farther from the truth because policies are never made, they are always in the process of being made. They're never finished — they're always being refinished. Think about it — most people evaporate when the decision is made. Part of your fluid participation problem is that as soon as the policy is made most people just disappear into the woodwork leaving it to the administration to work or distort anything the way it pleases. The administrator can then take the policy and just do anything he wishes with it. Remember if goals are diffuse, policies are usually diffuse too. And so once the policy-making committee is through with it the administrator takes it over and often does pretty well what he pleases with it. Set deadlines — things don't happen without deadlines. Restructure the rewards system so that the people who are involved know that they are going to be rewarded for actually carrying out the right policy. And then scrutinize it. Is it really happening? If it's not happening, bring it to the attention of those who are responsible.

I'm going to stop now and summarize for just a second. We are in a period in which the professionals are ruling the human service organizations. And I view that in some respects as a good thing — it's great to be professionalized, but in other ways I view it as a tragedy because the professionals are human beings like everybody else and they fundamentally are interested in what makes professionals happy. Given that kind of problem, given that kind of critique from the larger society, then how do we change the institutions that we're in? Well, in all probability, we probably don't. Let us be pessimistic to begin with. There aren't many of us who are going to be change agents — not many of us are going to change the institutions that we are working in, but if we should want to change then there are ways to do it. First you've got to have a vision, it's got to be a vision that's broader than the restricted visions of most professionals. Then you've got to understand the nature of the institution within which you're functioning. It is not a bureaucracy,

not a collegium, it is a miniature political system with fluid participation that is run by professionals, that has unclear goals, with unclear technology, has a diffuse goal-making system and terribly fluid kinds of decision structure to organize anarchy. Given that, then how does the Young Aspiring Machiavelli function? Concentrate your efforts, fight battles which can be won, fight with a goal in mind, learn the history, build the coalition, get on the committee and work hard. And then, very importantly, follow through, because if you don't follow through all your Machiavellian work is down the drain.

Charge to Student Affairs Officers:

BRING HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INTO FOCUS IN OUR UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES, THINK IN SYSTEMIC TERMS

Warren Bennis

(Excerpts from Sunday, April 8, 1973, dinner presentation)

... Now there's a further puzzle in higher education that's even more important.

David Riesman and Christopher Jencks noted in *The Academic Revolution* that the "academic revolution" was the development of the professional specialist in American higher education. People no longer call themselves "educators." If you ask them what they do, they say, "I am a psychologist, a physicist, an x-ologist . . ." We are clinging to the departmental banner and to professional groupings as security blankets that will not be given up easily and which contribute to a fragmentation of knowledge, to narrow specialties, and to academic rather than *educational* goals. In doing so, the university is in danger of losing contact with students, the professoriate of losing its responsiveness to its *raison d'etre*, the students.

So what we have are students who go through an institution where the reward system really doesn't do much more than pay salaries. We generate very little concern for the total human development. I feel like a lonely poet blowing in the wind when I quote E. M. Forster, who wrote in the frontispiece of *Howard's End*: "... only connect the objective, cognitive, past, present, and future."

A dramatic fact about the learning environments of higher education is that tenured appointments are being made by the faculty without substantive input by the Student Affairs office. They will have input because they must.

Think about the buildings we are building . . . buildings which are much more the Oedipus complexes of the architect or donors, or the last monuments of those who like big marble things, rather than buildings thought of as learning centers. In Washington now, before any Federal money can be given to build a Federal building, Nancy Hanks has to give it her aesthetic okay. I think Student Affairs personnel should be involved in a similar fashion on our campuses.

I'm also going to call on Student Affairs to develop a list of social indicators of what a learning community is; it's a tough job but it's not impossible. Can you imagine indicators of what we would mean by a humane, democratic learning environment that we can use like a template to assist in making all decisions . . .?

On another matter I wish to state that we need counseling very much. There will always be people who need help. I am not about to make a cryptic attack on counseling. However, I fear that if Student Affairs personnel allow themselves to be used only as counselors, presently defined, there may be serious and unfortunate consequences to them and

Warren Bennis is President, University of Cincinnati. to society. I'd like to tell you why. When you are counseling people, what you are saying, for the most part, is that we are dealing with a weak and bad system. We are taking all of the people who have been hurt, all the little murders that occur every day in a large bureaucracy, and providing band-aids. Now that's not trivial; band-aids are helpful. (Parenthetically, I've also noticed that in our universities, the counseling offices are placed in the basement, or out near the baseball field, the way mental hospitals used to be put out in the exurbs. But now we are closing in on them and can no longer protect ourselves from their sight.) But: counseling protects the status quo by taking care of the rejects and the casualties the system extrudes. In order to deepen and broaden the impact of counseling, I'm calling on our Student Affairs officers to become social architects; calling on them to become change agents in order to alter the systemic "trouble spots" in these social systems. There is this kind of knowledge and ability in addition to counseling in a professional Student Affairs staff. Unless you become such change agents, you're not going to realize your own effectiveness — you're not going to be pro-active. You'll just be band-aiding those casualties, and taking everybody else off the hook, and I don't want to see you do that.

Charlie Brown once said, "There's no heavier burden than a great potential." So we, you and I, must have to have the courage to face our needs, our weaknesses and strengths, with the same objective vigor and imagination that we bring to bear on our scholarly studies. And you must find a way to do it in a scholarly and university way, and not just a student way, thereby bringing the student's and society's needs back into the university's agenda.

Trying To Be Real, But Compared to What?

Benjamin F. Payton
(Excerpts from Tuesday, April 11, 1973, banguet presentation)

Some of you have heard the record by Les McCann, also done by Roberta Flack, "Trying to be Real, Compared to What?" I think it is rather expressive of the general mood and style of our time. If you can listen to the words you will note the song carries a very biting commentary of both the conventional and the avant garde morality of our time. It is spoken from the perspective of a person who has lost all of his illusions about money, about society and about God. And he said of the would-be leaders — you want me to be real according to your notion of real, but compared to what? . . .

Whether intended or not the university contributes to students relating to one cause after another, seeking what is real in a kind of "trendsy" way rather than dealing with the questions of powerlessness, alienation, manipulating symbols, cultural, moral, political, and ethical questions. They're always looking for that which is newest, most avant garde, that which expresses the fashion of the times. And so one author characterizes American scholars and students as engaged in a constant form of ideological promiscuity going from one idea to another, from one concern to another, seldom completing anything. The student is left without any sense of depth about what it is he is involved in, what it all means and how it relates to what his life can and indeed ought to become. This should obviously be of concern to those who are in student-personnel administration . . .

Students have gone through movements which promised significant change. Yet society has delivered little of these promises. We hired a couple of Black professors to the staff, we did increase the number of Black students and Chicanos and Indians, but when one asks, "What is happening at the university to take care of the students and the needs they bring that enables the university and its structure to deal with them positively and constructively wherever they are?" one gets, if not a deafening silence, a great deal of equivocating. There are very real reasons why many students fail to engage with administrators in conversations about directions in which they want to go and in which they would want to see the university go these days...

They've seen only the revolving-door phenomenon. It's a numbers game; everybody wants to get as much Federal student financial aid as possible. Everybody wants to polish up his vital image. What happens to that student? . . . Minority students in the university are saying, "You want us to be *real*, but according to preconceived patterns." Very often

Benjamin F. Payton is Officer in Charge of Minority Programs, Higher Education and Research, The Ford Foundation; formerly, Professor, Howard University. students are not brought into the conversation about how these patterns can impinge upon our lives.

We've had all kinds of absurd, ridiculous responses to student demands yet very little reflection on what it is we ought to be doing with students in order to truly help... I think students are looking for a depth of reality which has to go beneath political risk. For example, Black students are searching not only for Afro-American style and cultural styles they consider relevant, but for academic substance and conduct. And they're searching for student personnel assistance that can give them the finality of guidance that very often challenges their notions of what is right and what is wrong. I think one of the jobs of a teacher, of a student personnel administrator, is to help students acquire mature self development — which after all is what life is all about. "The valuable intellectual development is self development," says Alfred North Whitehead.

It is one thing to suggest that the university ignore the experiences of minorities — it is quite another thing to play a political game. To give one group a little piece of a program and another group a little piece does not encourage the necessary reflection on the meanings of this program, nor does not prompt the essential interface with other university programs. It does not enable all students to confront the pluralistic heritage and background that constitutes America. Black studies are just as important to White students as to Black students, sometimes I think it is more imporant. It is important that it be under Black initiative because it is going to take a long time for this nation, student personnel administrators as well as faculty, to overcome the heritage of racism and lead such programs in constructive ways. Yet no university should establish programs haphazardly or without serious academic as well as social purposes.

We now approach a day of re-evaluation and it is high time we take the job much more seriously than we have in the past. It will necessitate student personnel service administrators having the willingness to open themselves up really and truly to students — all kinds of students. The day of merely emoting with students and being sympathetic must be over.

What faculty member, what college president would say these days to either White or Black students there is a discipline involved in this university and in this college . . . The cost of education is rising and demands are being made upon us by sources external to the university. If the college is going to survive, it must be real in what it is doing; if it's going to help the students, it must come to a greater degree of seriousness of purpose.

Educational Capitalism, Educational Welfarism, and the Counseling Syndrome

John L. Blackburn

The first part of my remarks is done somewhat facetiously, with slight tongue-in-cheek, for the purpose of stimulating our thinking about higher education and the role of student personnel administration. I hope you will bear with me and not be too offended by some comments I am about to make.

Educational Capitalism is an educational system in which learning is considered a commodity for which individuals compete. Decisions about the nature of this commodity are made by a rather small group of people who have interlocking roles and relationships with the government, foundations, disciplines, and the professions.

Students are free to participate in the commodity (learning) as they wish, but since the means of production of the commodity are not under the control of the students, students (if they are to learn at all) must participate in the system as defined by the decision makers. These people are, for all practical purposes, the owners of the educational system though it is often subsidized by both governments and philanthropic endeavors similar in many ways to other capitalistic enterprises in our society.

Educational Capitalists are those faculty, administrators, and researchers who, though they may have little faith in capitalism as an economic system, have complete faith in rugged individualism and the survival of the fittest in the academic marketplace. There is a common perception that not all in our society should share in the commodity (learning) for fear that its value would become debased, and at the same time a common perception is that those who do not succeed in the pursuit of the commodity (learning) are maladjusted, sick, or problem students.

Just as Economic Capitalists found that a welfare system needed to be developed to deal with the unsuccessful participants in the economy, Educational Capitalists found that education needed a welfare system to deal with the unsuccessful participants in the learning process — hence the growth of student personnel work as the welfare system of higher education. The role of student personnel work is to fulfill for the educational process what the social welfare system is to fulfill for the larger society.

The Educational Capitalists, under the guise of educational reform and often cloaked in liberal jargon, are stating that education isn't for everyone and are advocating alternate

John L. Blackburn is Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs University of Denver. Dr. Blackburn is NASPA President, 1973-74. approaches which are designed to give many young people training for limited roles in our society. On the surface this has some appeal, but when one finds out that the advocates for this philosophy tend to have their own children in the best schools, colleges, and universities in this nation — then one rightly becomes very suspicious of what this advocacy is all about.

I am afraid that what is happening today is that the disadvantaged Whites, Blacks, Indians, and Chicanos are being inculcated with the idea that education isn't really that important. If this philosophy prevails, then fewer young people will pursue higher education, but which students will go on? Obviously the students continuing their educational programs will come from homes and environments which have by tradition stressed education and learning for its own sake; thus we are on the verge of returning to an educated elite which will be predominately white, middle and upper-middle class. This appears to me to be developing at the very time we have made great progress in opening up educational opportunity for all.

Higher education has an obsession with the individual and his personal development. The students compete with each other as individuals to get into the process and must continue to compete with each other to survive. Thus students who assist each other in learning do so at their-own peril of survival. Students who have problems in surviving become wards of the student personnel worker.

Recently there has been a great volume of literature under the heading of student development. The American College Personnel Association has released a monograph entitled "Student Development in Tomorrow's Higher Education: A Return to the Academy." This document serves a great need in that it will provoke discussion of the role of student personnel work in higher education.

The difficulty in dealing with the term "student development" is the all-encompassing aspect of the term which results in anyone and everyone being able to embrace the concept in such a way that all can do, and continue to do, what they are doing and call it "student development."

To me, the term "student development" has lost its potential impact without even having a fair trial. The weakness of the concept, I believe, is that it lacks a theoretical construct that will clearly distinguish it from past practices and operations. The underlying construct which appears to have permeated all aspects of student personnel work is what I will designate as the "counseling syndrome" with its emphasis upon individual face-to-face relationships. The "counseling syndrome" always has the student in a patient or client relationship with the student personnel worker. The so-called "student personnel point of view" places its emphasis upon the "whole student," but the whole student has to interact with a host of counselors — placement counselors, academic counselors, vocational counselors, residence hall counselors, psychological counselors, and many others.

This army of counselors, all committed to the "whole student," succeeded in dividing up the students by parts. More seriously, however, the training and practice of the student personnel worker ignored the fact that one of the critical aspects of individual personal development is the presence, or absence, of a healthy community. We seemed to assume that if we worked with the individual students who sought or were perceived as needing assistance, and if we helped these individuals, that was about all that was necessary. This approach assumed that the aggregate of students wasn't really a responsibility for the student personnel worker and was beyond his purview, except where he could influence individuals who, in turn, might have an impact on the community.

To put it more bluntly, student personnel work, like the rest of higher educaton, has an obsession with the individual and his personal development, and this obsession has put a perimeter on student affairs that has prohibited student personnel administrators from having a dramatic impact upon the campus. It has also resulted in the staff being responders to the initiative of others and particularly the student rather than being change makers or initiators of campus societal programs.

There are many places where we can put the blame for the feeling of alienation in our society, but, in my judgment, the "counseling syndrome" is high on the list for causing alienation in the campus community. We are so busy dealing with the problems which students have as the result of the absence of community that we overlook the cause of many of their problems — a decommunitized society.

Student development, good mental health, and individual personal development are not ends. They should be by-products of what we do on the college campus. Before we can provide these by-products we must develop campus communities, and if we have healthy, vibrant, intellectual communities, students will learn, will develop, and will, hopefully, carry community development skills out into the larger society.

I want to stress that I am not opposed to counselors. Higher education and the student personnel area need a greater number of better trained counselors. My concern is that counselor training and counselor philosophy do not necessarily provide the right background and training for the majority of the student personnel workers.

The void that I see is that we do not have the expertise in student personnel administration which can take an aggregate of students and introduce certain interactions into the aggregate in such a way that a community develops which meets the needs of the constituents for identity, stimulation, and security. For too long the student personnel administrator has had to depend upon rules, regulations, and laws to hold the community together. We have little understanding as to how *mores* come about, as to how they can be developed, or reinforced.

My thesis is that the comunity construct offers a basis upon which so-called student personnel work can make an exciting contribution to higher education. This will, in essence, get to the *cause* of the educational welfare types of maladjusted and problem students with which the student personnel worker has so long been dealing.

Students should not be perceived as clients, patients, or welfare types. Administrators of student affairs should not perceive themselves or be perceived by others as social workers, counselors, or psychologists even though they may have had one of these experiences in the past. The student personnel administrator should perceive herself or himself as the head of a vast and exciting division of the institution which has some hypothesis about the effects of the division on the total education of the students, and which develops the environment by introducing certain interactions and services in such a way that the success can be measured against the hypothesis.

I am not naive enough to think that the creation of a mosaic of interlocking communities will be a panacea, and that all individual student problems will disappear with the creating of healthy communities. However, I do feel that if these communities could exist, could be brought forth, that many more students would have a more intensified, intellectual experience and a more personally enhanced total development.

1973 NASPA CONFERENCE

April 8-11, 1973 Benjamin Franklin Hotel Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Chairperson

James R. Appleton Vice-President, Student Affairs University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007

Assistant Chairpersons

Laurence Sartor Dean of Students St. Joseph's College Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131

Dudley B. Woodard, Jr. Dean for Student Life Oakland University Rochester, Michigan 48063

FUTURE NASPA CONFERENCES

1974 NASPA CONFERENCE
April 14-16
Chicago Hilton
Chicago, Illinois

1975 NASPA CONFERENCE March 30-April 2 Hilton Hotel San Francisco, California

1976 NASPA CONFERENCE
March 28-31
Fairmont Hotel
Dallas, Texas

NASPA Central Office • Portland State University
P.O. Box 751 • Portland, Oregon 97207

Non-Profit Organization U. S. Postage

PAID

PORTLAND, OREGON Permit No. 770

WITTEN CHARLES H
VP STU AFFAIRS
SOUTH CAROLINA, UNIV OF
COLUMBIA SC

29208